THE

MERCERSBURG REVIEW.

JULY, 1861.

Art. I.—THE MORAL CHARACTER OF JESUS CHRIST, OR THE PERFECTION OF CHRIST'S HUMANITY A PROOF OF HIS DIVINITY.

When the Angel of the Lord appeared to Moses in the burning bush, he was commanded to put off his shoes from his feet: for the place whereon he stood, was holy ground. With what reverence and awe then should we approach the contemplation of the great reality—God manifest in the flesh—of which the vision of Moses was but a significant type and shadow!

The life and character of Jesus Christ is truly the holy of holies in the history of the world. Eighteen hundred years have passed away, since He appeared in the fulness of time on this earth to redeem a fallen race from sin and death, and to open a never ceasing fountain of righteousness and life. The ages before him anxiously awaited his coming, as the desire of all nations; the ages after him proclaim his glory and ever extend his dominion. The noblest and best of men under every clime hold him in the purest affection and the profoundest gratitude, not only, but in divine adoration and worship. His name is above every name that may be named in heaven or on earth, and the only one whereby the sinner can be saved. He is Immanuel, God with us, the Eternal Word become flesh, very God and very man in one undivided person, the Author of the new creation, the Way, the Truth, and the Life, the Prophet, Priest and King of regenerate humanity, the Saviour of the world. Thus He stands out to the faith of

the entire Christian Church, Greek, Latin, and Evangelical, in every civilized country on the globe. His power is now greater, his kingdom larger than ever, and will continue to spread, until all nations shall bow before him and kiss his sceptre of righteousness and peace.

Blessed is he who from the heart can believe that Jesus is the Son of God and the fountain of salvation. True faith is indeed no work of nature, but an act of God wrought in the soul by the Holy Ghost, who reveals Christ to us in his true character, as Christ revealed the Father. Faith with its justifying, sanctifying and saving power is independent of science and learning, and may be kindled even in the heart of a little child and an illiterate slave. It is the peculiar glory of the Redeemer and his religion to be coëxtensive with humanity itself without distinction of sex, age, nation and race. His saving grace flows and overflows to all and for all, on the simple condition of repentance and faith.

This fact, however, does not supersede the necessity of thought and argument. Revelation, although above nature and above reason, is not against nature and against reason. On the contrary, nature and the supernatural as has been well said by a distinguished New England divine, "constitute together the one system of God."* Christianity satisfies the deepest intellectual as well as moral and religious wants of man who is created in the image and for the glory of God. It is the revelation of truth as well as of life. Faith and knowledge, pistis and gnosis, are not antagonistic but complementary forces, not enemies but

* By Horace Bushnell in his recent work on the subject. The same idea Dr. John W. Nevin, in his able work "*The Mystical Presence*," Philad., 1846, p. 199, expresses in these words: "Nature and Revelation, the world and Christianity, as springing from the same divine Mind, are not two different systems joined together in a merely outward way. They form a single whole, harmonious with itself in all its parts. The sense of the one then is necessarily included and comprehended in the sense of the other. The mystery of the new creation must involve in the end the mystery of the old; and the key that serves to unlock the meaning of the first, must serve to unlock the inmost secret of the last."

inseparable twin sisters. Faith precedes knowledge, but it just as necessarily leads to knowledge; while true knowledge on the other hand is always rooted and grounded in faith and tends to confirm and to strengthen it. Thus we find the two combined in the famous confession of Peter when he says in the name of all the other apostles: "We believe and we know that Thou art the Christ."* But so intimately are both connected that we may also reverse the famous maxim of Augustine, Anselm and Schleiermacher: *Fides praecedit intellectum*, and say: *Intellectus praecedit fidem.* For how can we believe in any object without at least some general historical knowledge of its existence and character? Faith even in its first form, as a submission to the authority of God and an assent to the truth of his revelation, is an exercise of the mind and reason as well as of the heart and the will. An idiot or a madman cannot believe. Our religion demands not a blind, but a rational, intelligent faith, and this just in proportion to its strength and fervor aims at an ever deepening insight into its own sacred contents and object.

As living faith in Christ is the soul and centre of all sound practical Christianity and piety, so the true doctrine of Christ is the soul and centre of all sound Christian theology. St. John makes the denial of the incarnation of the Son of God the criterion of antichrist, and consequently the belief in this central truth the test of Christianity. The incarnation and the divine glory shining through the veil of Christ's humanity is the grand theme of his Gospel, which he wrote with the pen of an angel from the very heart of Christ, as his favorite disciple and bosom-friend. The Apostles' Creed starting as it does from the confession of Peter makes the article on Christ most prominent and assigns to it the central position between the preceding article on God the Father, and the succeeding article on the Holy Ghost. The development of ancient Catholic theol-

* John 6, 69: ἡμεῖς πεπιστεύκαμεν καὶ ἐγνώκαμεν, credidimus et cognovimus. The reverse order we have in John 10, 38: "that ye may know and believe that the Father is in me, and I in him."

ogy commenced and culminated with the triumphant defense of the true divinity and true humanity of Christ, against the opposite heresies of Judaizing Ebionism which denied the former, and paganizing Gnosticism which resolved the latter into a shadowy phantom. The evangelical Protestant theology is essentially christological or controlled throughout by the proper idea of Christ as the God-man and Saviour. This is emphatically the article of the standing or falling Church. In this the two most prominent ideas of the Reformation, the doctrine of the supremacy of the Scriptures, and the doctrine of justification by grace through faith, meet and are vitally united. Christ's word—the only unerring and efficient guide of truth, Christ's work—the only unfailing and sufficient source of peace, Christ—all in all, this is the principle of genuine Protestantism.

In the construction of the true doctrine of Christ's person we may, with St. John in the prologue to his Gospel, begin from above with his eternal Godhead and proceed through the creation and the preparatory revelation of the Old Testament dispensation till we reach the incarnation and his truly human life for the redemption of the race. Or, with the other evangelists, we may begin from below with his birth from the Virgin Mary and rise up through the successive stages of his earthly life, his discourses and miracles to his assumption into that divine glory which he had before the foundation of the world. The result reached in both cases is the same, that Christ unites in his person the whole fulness of the Godhead and the whole fulness of sinless manhood.

The older theologians, both Catholic and Evangelical, proved the divinity of the Saviour in a direct way from the miracles performed by him, and the prophecies fulfilled in him, from the divine names which he bears, from the divine attributes which are predicated of him, from the divine works which he performed, and from the divine honors which he claimed, and which were fully accorded to him by his apostles and the whole Christian Church to this day.

But it may also be proved by the opposite process, the contemplation of the singular perfection of his humanity, which rises, by almost universal consent even of unbelievers, so far above every human greatness known before or since, that it can only be rationally explained on the ground of such an essential union with the Godhead as he claimed himself and as his inspired apostles ascribed to him. The more deeply we penetrate through the veil of his flesh, the more clearly we behold the glory of the Only Begotten of the Father shining through the same, full of grace and of truth.*

Modern evangelical theology owes this new homage to the Saviour. The powerful attacks of the latest phase of infidelity upon the credibility of the Gospel History call for it and have already led, by way of reaction, to new triumphs of the old faith of the Church in her divine head. Our humanitarian, philanthropic and yet skeptical age is more susceptible for this argument than for the old dogmatic method of demonstration. With Thomas, the representative of honest and earnest skepticism among the apostles, it refuses to believe in the divinity of the Lord unless supported by the testimony of its senses; it desires to lay the finger into the print of his nails and to thrust the hand into his side, before it exclaim in humble adoration: "My Lord and my God."†

---

* Ullmann, *Sündlosigkeit Jesu*, 6th ed. p. 215: "So führt schon das Vollendet-Menschliche in Jesu, wenn wir es mit allem Uebrigen, was die Menschheit darbietet, vergleichen, zur Anerkennung des Göttlichen in ihm." Dorner, *Entwicklungsgeschichte der Lehre von der Person Christi*, 2nd ed. vol. II. p. 1211: "Jesu Heiligkeit und Weisheit, durch die er unter den sündigen, viel-irrenden Menschen einzig dasteht, weiset . . . auf einen übernatürlichen Ursprung seiner Person. Diese muss, um inmitten der Sünderwelt begreiflich zu sein, aus einer eigenthümlichen und wunderbar schöpferischen That Gottes abgeleitet, ja es muss in Christus . . . von Gott aus betrachtet, eine Incarnation göttlicher Liebe, also göttlichen Wesens gesehen werden, was ihn als den Punkt erscheinen lässt, wo Gott und die Menschheit einzig und innigst geeinigt sind." Compare also Ebrard, *Christliche Dogmatik*, 1852, vol. II. p. 24–31.

† A Life of Christ written from this stand-point and rising from the humanity to the divinity of the Saviour, is yet a desideratum in our theological

It is from this point of view that we will endeavor, in as popular and concise a manner as the difficulty of the subject and the dignity of the occasion permit, to analyze and exhibit the human character of Christ. We propose to take up the man Jesus of Nazareth as he appears on the simple, unsophisticated record of the plain and honest fishermen of Galilee, and as he lives in the faith of Christendom, and we shall find him in all the stages of his life both as a private individual and as a public character so far elevated above the reach of successful rivalry and so singularly perfect that this very perfection in midst of an imperfect and sinful world constitutes an irresistible proof of his divinity.

A full discussion of the subject would require us to consider Christ in his official as well as personal character, and to describe him as a teacher, a reformer, a worker of miracles, and the founder of a spiritual kingdom universal in extent and perpetual in time. From every point of view

---

literature. But we have important contributions towards it, especially by three modern divines, a German, an English, and an American, which shows that this view of Christ forces itself upon the thinking minds of the three nations which now take the lead in Protestant theological science and literature. We refer to Dr. C. Ullmann: *Die Suendlosigkeit Jesu. Eine apologetische Betrachtung* (first published in the "*Studien und Kritiken*," 1828, Heft 1), 6th ed. Heidelberg, 1853 (translated into English by Lundin Brown: *The Sinlessness of Jesus: an Evidence of Christianity*. Edinburgh, 1858); John Young: *The Christ of History; an Argument grounded in the facts of his Life on earth*, republ. New York, 1856; and Horace Bushnell: *Nature and the Supernatural, as together constituting the one System of God*, New York, 1858; Chapter X and XI. p. 276–366. Compare also the beautiful Essay of the late Dr. James W. Alexander of New York, on the *Character of Jesus, an Argument for the Divine Origin of Christianity* (published in the "Lectures on the Evidences of Christianity delivered at the University of Virginia," New York, 1852, p. 193–211), and my *History of the Apostolic Church*, New York, 1853, (first in German at Mercersburg, 1851) p. 433 ff., and my *History of the Christian Church in the first three Centuries*, p. 53–59. It should be stated that the apologetic anti-Strauss literature on the Life of Jesus, especially Neander, Lange, Olshausen, Ebrard, Tholuck, Hoffmann, Schmid and Dorner, have brought out the ethical element and human perfection of Christ more fully than had been done before. The French works of E. Dandiran: *Essai sur la divinite du caractere moral de Jesus-Christ*, Genève, 1850, and of Edm. de Pressensé: *Le Redempteur*, Par., 1854, which seem to follow the same train of thought, we know only by name.

we would be irresistibly driven to the same result. But our present purpose confines us to the consideration of his personal character, and this alone, we think, is sufficient for the conclusion.

Christ passed through all the stages of human life from infancy to manhood, and represented each in its ideal form, that he might redeem and sanctify them all and be a perpetual model for imitation. He was the model infant, the model boy, the model youth, and the model man.* But the weakness, decline and decrepitude of old age would be incompatible with his character and mission. He died and rose in the full bloom of early manhood, and lives in the hearts of his people in unfading freshness and unbroken vigor for ever.

Let us first glance at the infancy and boyhood of the Saviour. The history of the race commences with the beauty of innocent youth in the garden of Eden, "when the morning stars sang together and all the sons of God shouted for joy," in beholding Adam and Eve created in the image of their Maker, the crowning glory of all his wonderful works. So the second Adam, the Redeemer of the fallen race, The Restorer and Perfecter of man, comes first before us in the accounts of the Gospels as a child born, not in paradise, it is true, but among the dreary ruins of sin and death, from an humble virgin, in a lowly manger,—yet pure and innocent, the subject of the praise of angels and

---

* This idea is almost as old as the Christian Church and was already pretty clearly taught by Irenaeus, who, through the single link of his teacher Polycarp, stood connected with the age of St. John the apostle. He says, *Adv. Haereses*, lib. II. cap. 22. § 4: "Omnes enim venit (Christus) per semetipsum salvare, omnes, inquam, qui per eum renascuntur in Deum, infantes et parvulos et pueros et seniores. Ideo per omnem venit aetatem et infantibus infans factus, sanctificans infantes; in parvulis parvulus, sanctificans hanc ipsam habentes aetatem, simul et exemplum illis pietatis effectus et justitiae et subjectionis; in juvenibus juvenis, exemplum juvenibus ficus et sanctificans Domino. Sic et senior in senioribus (?), ut sit perfectus magister in omnibus," etc. But Irenaeus erred in carrying the idea too far and assuming Christ to have lived over fifty years, on the ground of the indefinite estimate of the Jews, John 8, 57. Hippolytus, in his recently discovered *Philosophumena*, expresses the same view.

the adoration of men. Heaven and earth, the Shepherds of Bethlehem in the name of Israel longing after salvation, and the Wise Men from the East as the representatives of heathenism in its dark groping after the "unknown God," unite in the worship of the new born King and Saviour. Here we meet at the very threshold of the earthly history of Christ that singular combination of humility and grandeur, of simplicity and sublimity, of the human and divine which characterizes it throughout, and distinguishes it from every other history. He is not represented as an unnatural prodigy, anticipating the maturity of a later age, but as a truly human child, silently lying and smiling on the bosom of his Virgin mother, "growing" and "waxing strong in spirit,"† and therefore subject to the law of regular development; yet differing from all other children by his supernatural conception and perfect freedom from hereditary sin and guilt. He appears in the celestial beauty of unspotted innocence, a veritable flower of paradise. He was "that Holy Thing," according to the announcement of the angel Gabriel, ‡ admired and loved by all who approached him in childlike spirit, but exciting the dark suspicion of the tyrant king who represented his future enemies and persecutors. Who can measure the ennobling, purifying and cheering influence which proceeds from the contemplation of the Christ-child at each returning Christmas season upon the hearts of young and old in every land and nation! The loss of the first estate is richly compensated by the undying innocence of paradise regained.

Of the boyhood of Jesus we know only one fact, recorded by Luke, but it is in perfect keeping with the peculiar charm of his childhood and forshadows at the same time the glory of his public life, as one uninterrupted service of his heavenly Father.‖ When twelve years old we find him

---

† Luke 2, 40. Comp. 2, 52. Heb. 2, 10–18 and 5, 8 and 9, where it is said, that he *learned* obedience, and being made perfect he *became* the author of eternal salvation. ‡ Luke 1, 35.

‖ Dr. J. P. Lange, in his *Leben Jesu nach den Evangelien*, Heidelberg, 1844, sqq. vol. II. p. 127, says: Die Geschichte des zwölfjährigen Jesu repräsentirt

in the temple in the midst of the Jewish doctors, not teaching and offending them, as in the apocryphal Gospels, by any immodesty or forwardness, but hearing and asking questions, thus actually learning from them; and yet filling them with astonishment at his understanding and answers. There is nothing premature, forced or unbecoming his age, and yet a degree of wisdom and an intensity of interest in religion which rises far above a purely human youth. "He increased," we are told, "in wisdom and stature and in favor with God and man;"§ he was subject to his parents and practised all the virtues of an obedient son; and yet he filled them with a sacred awe as they saw him absorbed in "the things of his Father," ¶ and heard him utter words, which they were unable to understand at the time, but which Mary treasured up in her heart as a holy secret, convinced that they must have some deep meaning answering to the mystery of his supernatural conception and birth.

Such an idea of a harmless and faultless heavenly childhood, of a growing, learning, and yet surprisingly wise boyhood, as it meets us in living reality at the portal of the Gospel history, never entered the imagination of biographer, poet, or philosopher before. On the contrary, as has been justly observed by an able American divine,* "in all

---

seine ganze Entwicklung. Sie ist seine charakterische Knabenthat, die Offenbarung seines jugendlichen Lebens; ein Wiederglanz der Herrlichkeit seiner Geburt, ein Vorzeichen seines zukünftigen Heldenlaufes Sie stellt die Kindheit seiner Idealität dar; deswegen auch die Idealität der Kindheit überhaupt." Compare also the suggestive remarks of Olshausen to that passage *Commentar*, (3rd Germ. ed) vol. I. p. 145 ff. §Luke 2, 52.

¶ Luke 2, 49: ἐν τοῖς τοῦ πατρός μου δεῖ, (the δεῖ indicates a *moral* necessity which is identical with true freedom) εἶναί με. The fathers and most of the modern commentators refer the τοῖς to the *house* of God, or the temple. This is grammatically allowable, but restricts the sense and deprives it of its deeper meaning. For he could only occasionally be in the temple of Jerusalem. Nearly all the English versions, Tyndal, Cranmer, Geneva, and James, translate more correctly "about my father's business." But we object to the *business* in this connection, and prefer the more literal translation "*in* (not *about*) *the things* (or affairs) of my Father." The *in* signifies the life element in which Christ moved during his whole life, whether in the temple or out of it.

* Horace Bushnell, in his genial work already quoted, on *Nature and the Supernatural*, p. 280.

the higher ranges of character, the excellence portrayed is never the simple unfolding of a harmonious and perfect beauty contained in the germ of childhood, but it is a character formed by a process of rectification in which many follies are mended and distempers removed, in which confidence is checked by defeat, passion moderated by reason, smartness sobered by experience. Commonly a certain pleasure is taken in showing how the many wayward sallies of the boy are, at length, reduced by discipline to the character of wisdom, justice, and public heroism so much admired. Besides, if any writer, of almost any age, will undertake to describe, not merely a spotless, but a superhuman or celestial childhood, not having the reality before him, he must be somewhat more than human himself, if he does not pile together a mass of clumsy exaggerations, and draw and overdraw, till neither heaven nor earth can find any verisimilitude in the picture."

This unnatural exaggeration, into which the mythical fancy of man, in its endeavor to produce a superhuman childhood and boyhood, will inevitably fall, is strikingly exhibited in the apocryphal Gospels, which are related to the canonical Gospels as the counterfeit to the genuine coin, or as a revolting caricature to the inimitable original, but which by the very contrast tend, negatively, to corroborate the truth of the evangelical history. While the evangelists expressly reserve the performance of miracles to the age of maturity and public life, and observe a significant silence concerning the parents of Jesus, the pseudo-evangelists fill the infancy and early years of the Saviour and his mother with the strangest prodigies, and make the active intercession of Mary very prominent throughout. According to their representation, even dumb idols, irrational beasts, and senseless trees, bow in adoration before the infant Jesus on his journey to Egypt, and after his return, when yet a boy of five or seven years, he changes balls of clay into flying birds for the idle amusement of his playmates, strikes terror round about him, dries up a stream of water by a mere word, transforms his

companions into goats, raises the dead to life, and performs all sorts of miraculous cures through a magical influence which proceeds from the very water in which he was washed, the towels which he used, and the bed on which he slept.* Here we have the falsehood and absurdity of unnatural fiction, while the New Testament presents us the truth and beauty of a supernatural, yet most real history which shines out only in brighter colors by the contrast of the mythical shadow.

With the exception of these few but significant hints, the youth of Jesus and the preparation for his public ministry are enshrined in mysterious silence. But we know the outward condition and circumstances, under which he grew up; and these must be admitted to furnish no explanation for the astounding results without the admission of the supernatural and divine element in his life.

He grew up among a people seldom and only contemptuously named by the ancient classics, and subjected at the time to the yoke of a foreign oppressor; in a remote and conquered province of the Roman empire; in the darkest district of Palestine; in a little country town of proverbial insignificance; in poverty and manual labor, in the obscurity of a carpenter's shop; far away from universities, academies, libraries, and literary or polished society; without any help, as far as we know, except the parental care, the book of nature, the Old Testament Scriptures, and the secret intercourse of his soul with God the heavenly Father. Hence the question of Nathanael: "What good can come out of Nazareth?" Hence the natural surprise of the Jews, who knew all his human relations and antecedents. "How knoweth this man letters," they asked, when they heard Jesus teach, "having never learned?" † And on another occasion, when he taught in the synagogue: "Whence hath this man this wisdom and these mighty works? Is not this the carpenter's son? is not his mother

* See the particulars with ample quotations from the sources in Rud. Hofmann's *Leben Jesu nach den Apokryphen im Zusammenhang aus den Quellen erzaehlt und wissenschaftlich untersucht.* Leipzig, 1851. p. 140—263.

† John 7, 15.

called Mary? and his brethren, James and Joses and Simon and Judas? And his sisters, are they not all with us? Whence then hath this man all these things?" * These questions are unavoidable and unanswerable if Christ be regarded a mere man. For each effect presupposes a corresponding cause.

The difficulty here presented can by no means be solved by a reference to the fact that many, perhaps the majority of great men, especially in the Church, have risen by their own industry and perseverance from the lower walks of life and from a severe contest with poverty and obstacles of every kind. The fact itself is readily conceded; but in every one of these cases schools, or books, or patrons and friends, or peculiar events and influences, can be pointed out, as auxiliary aids in the development of intellectual or moral greatness. There is always some human or natural cause, or combination of causes, which accounts for the final result.

Luther, for instance, was, indeed, the son of poor peasants and had a very hard youth, but yet he went to the schools of Mansfeld, Magdeburg and Eisenach, to the University of Erfurt, passed through the ascetic discipline of convent life, lived in a university surrounded by professors, students and libraries, and was innocently as it were made a reformer by extraordinary events and the irresistible current of his age.

Shakspeare is generally and justly regarded as the most remarkable and almost wonderful example of a self-taught man, who without the regular routine of school education became the greatest dramatic poet of all times. But the absurd idea that the son of the Warwickshire yeoman, or butcher, or glover—we hardly know which—was essentially an unlearned man, and jumped with one bound from the supposed but poorly authenticated youthful folly of deer-stealing to the highest position in literature, has long since

---

* Matth. 13, 54—56. Comp. also Mark 6, 3. "Is not this the carpenter, the son of Mary," etc., from which it would appear that Jesus himself engaged in the trade of Joseph.

been abandoned. It is certain that he spent several years in the free grammar school of Stratford upon-Avon, where he probably acquired the "small Latin and less Greek" which, however small in the eyes of so profound a scholar as Ben Johnson, was certainly large enough to make the fortune of any enterprising young Yankee. And whatever were the defects of his training, he must have made them up by intense private study of books and the closest observation of man and things. For his dramas—the occasional chronological, historical and geographical mistakes notwithstanding, which are small matters at all events, and in most cases, as in "Pericles" and in "Midsummer Night's Dream," intentional or mere freaks of fancy—abound in the most accurate and comprehensive knowledge of human nature under all its types and conditions, in the cold north and the sunny south, in the fifteenth century and at the time of Cæsar, under the influence of Christianity and of Judaism, together with a great variety of historical and other information which cannot be acquired without immense industry and the help of oral or written instruction.* Moreover he lived in the city of London, united the offices of actor, manager and writer, in the classic age of Elizabeth, during the closing scenes of the greatest upheaving of the human mind which ever took place since the introduction of Christianity, in the company of genial and gifted friends, and with free access to the highest ranks of blood, wealth and wit.

In the case of Christ no such natural explanation can be given. All the attempts to bring him into contact with Egyptian wisdom, or the Essenic theosophy, or other sources of learning, are without a shadow of proof, and explain nothing after all. For, unlike all other great men, even the prophets and the apostles, he was absolutely original and independent. He taught the world as one who had

* Comp. G. G. Gervinus: *Shakspeare*, Leipzig, 1850, vol. i. p. 38—41. This masterly critic and expounder of the British poet pronounces him one of the best and most extensively informed men of his age: "Es ist heute kein Wagniss mehr, zu sagen, dass Shakspeare in jener Zeit an Umfang vielfachen Wissens sehr wenige seines Gleichen gehabt habe."

learned nothing from it and was under no obligation to it. "His character and life were originated and sustained in spite of circumstances with which no earthly force could have contended, and therefore must have had their real foundation in a force which was preternatural and divine."* At the same time it is easy to see, from the admission of Christ's divinity, that by this condescension he has raised humble origin, poverty, manual labor, and the lower orders of society, to a dignity and sacredness never known before, and has revolutionized the false standard of judging the value of men and things from their outward appearance, and of associating moral worth with social elevation, and moral degradation with low rank.

We now approach the public life of Jesus. In his thirtieth year, after the Messianic inauguration through the baptism by John as his immediate forerunner and personal representative of the Old Testament, both in its legal, and prophetic or evangelical aspect, and after the Messianic probation by the temptation in the wilderness—the counterpart of the temptation of the first Adam in paradise—he entered upon his great work.

His public life lasted only three years, and before he had reached the age of ordinary maturity, he died, in the full beauty and vigor of early manhood, without tasting the infirmities of declining years, which would inevitably mar the picture of the Regenerator of the race and the Prince of life. And yet, unlike all other men of his years, he combined with the freshness, energy and originating power of youth that wisdom, moderation and experience, which belong only to mature age. The short triennium of his public ministry contains more, even from a purely historical point of observation, than the longest life of the greatest and best of men. It is pregnant with the deepest meaning of the counsel of God and the destiny of the race. It is the ripe fruit of all preceding ages, the fulfilment of the hopes and desires of the Jewish and heathen mind, and the fruit-

* John Young, *The Christ of History*, p. 85.

ful germ of succeeding generations, containing the impulse to the purest thoughts and noblest actions down to the end of time. It is, "the end of a boundless past, the centre of a boundless present, and the beginning of a boundless future."*

How remarkable, how wonderful this contrast between the short duration, and the immeasurable significance of Christ's ministry! The Saviour of the world a youth!

Other men require a long succession of years to mature their minds and character and to make a lasting impression upon the world. There are exceptions, we admit. Alexander the Great, the last and most brilliant efflorescence of the ancient Greek nationality, died a young man of thirty three after having conquered the East to the borders of the Indus. But who would think of comparing an ambitious warrior, conquered by his own lust and dying a victim of his passion, with the spotless friend of sinners; a few bloody victories of the one with the peaceful triumphs of the other; and a huge military empire of force which crumbled to pieces as soon as it was erected, with the spiritual kingdom of truth and love which stands to this day and will last for ever? Nor should it be forgotten that the true significance and only value of Alexander's conquest lay beyond the horizon of his ambition and intention, and that by carrying the language and civilization of Greece to Asia and bringing together the Oriental and Occidental world, it prepared the way for the introduction of the universal religion of Christ.

There is another striking distinction of a general character between Christ and the heroes of history, which we must notice here. We should naturally suppose that such an uncommon personage, setting up the most astounding claims and proposing the most extraordinary work, would surround himself with extraordinary circumstances and maintain a position far above the vulgar and degraded multi-

* Heinrich Steffens, a follower of Schelling, says this of man, and bases upon this thought his System of Anthropology. But it may be applied in its fullest and absolute sense to Christ, as the ideal man, in whom and through whom alone the race can become complete.

tude around him. We should expect something uncommon and striking in his look, his dress, his manner, his mode of speech, his outward life, and the train of his attendants. But the very reverse is the case. His greatness is singularly unostentatious, modest and quiet, and far from repelling the beholder, it attracts and invites him to familiar approach. His public life never moved on the imposing arena of secular heroism, but within the humble circle of every day life, and the simple relations of a son, a brother, a citizen, a teacher and a friend. He had no army to command, no kingdom to rule, no prominent station to fill, no worldly favors and rewards to dispense. He was an humble individual, without friends and patrons in the Sanhedrim or at the court of Herod. He never mingled in familiar intercourse with the religious or social leaders of the nation, whom he had startled in his twelfth year by his questions and answers. He selected his disciples from among the illiterate fishermen of Galilee and promised them no reward in this world but a part in the bitter cup of his sufferings. He dined with publicans and sinners and mingled with the common people, without ever condescending to their low manners and habits. He was so poor that he had no place on which to rest his head. He depended for the supply of his modest wants on voluntary contributions of a few pious females, and the purse was in the hands of a thief and a traitor. Nor had he learning, art, or eloquence, in the usual sense of the term, nor any other kind of power, by which great men arrest the attention and secure the admiration of the world. The writers of Greece and Rome were ignorant even of his existence until, several years after the crucifixion, the effects of his mission in the steady growth of the sect of his followers forced from them some contemptuous notice and then roused them to opposition.

And yet this Jesus of Nazareth without money and arms conquered more millions than Alexander, Cæsar, Mahomet, and Napoleon; without science and learning he shed more light on things human and divine than all philosophers

and scholars combined; without the eloquence of schools he spoke words of life as were never spoken before or since, and produced effects which lie beyond the reach of orator or poet; without writing a single line he has set more pens in motion and furnished themes for more sermons, orations, discussions, learned volumes, works of art and sweet songs of praise than the whole army of great men of ancient and modern times. Born in a manger, and crucified as a malefactor, he now controls the destinies of the civilized world, and rules a spiritual empire which embraces one third of the inhabitants of the globe. There never was in this world a life so unpretending, modest and lowly in its outward form and condition, and yet producing such extraordinary effects upon all ages, nations and classes of men. The annals of history produce no other example of such complete and astounding success in spite of the absence of those material, social, literary and artistic powers and influences which are indispensable to success for a mere man. Christ stands also in this respect solitary and alone among all the heroes of history, and presents to us an insolvable problem, unless we admit him to be the eternal Son of God.

We will now attempt to describe his personal or moral and religious character, as it appears in the record of his public life, and then examine his own testimony of himself, as giving us the only rational solution of this mighty problem.

The first impression which we receive from the life of Jesus is that of its perfect innocency and sinlessness inmidst of a sinful world. He and He alone carried the spotless purity of childhood untarnished through his youth and manhood. Hence the lamb and the dove are his appropriate symbols.

He was, indeed, tempted as we are, but he never yielded to temptation.* His sinlessness was at first only the *rela-*

* Comp. with the history of the temptation in the wilderness, Matth. 4 and Luke 4, the significant passages in the epistle to the Hebrews, 4, 15: πεπειρασμένον κατὰ πάντα καθ' ὁμοιότητα, χωρὶς ἁμαρτίας' and 5, 8: καίπερ ὢν υἱός, ἔμαθεν ἀφ' ὧν ἔπαθεν τὴν ὑπακοήν.

tive sinlessness of Adam before the fall, which implies the necessity of trial and temptation and the peccability, or the possibility of the fall. Had he been endowed with absolute impeccability from the start, he could not be a true man, nor our model for imitation, his holiness instead of being his own self-acquired act and merit would be a mechanical gift, and his temptation an unreal show. But here is the great fundamental difference between the first and the second Adam: the first Adam lost his innocence by the abuse of his freedom and fell by his own act of disobedience into the dire necessity of sin, while the second Adam was innocent in the midst of sinners and maintained his innocence against all and every temptation. Christ's relative sinlessness or the *posse non peccare* became more and more *absolute* sinlessness or a *non posse peccare*, by his own moral act or the right use of his freedom in the absolute active and passive obedience to God.

In vain we look through the entire biography of Christ for a single stain or the slightest shadow on his moral character. There never lived a more harmless being on earth. He injured nobody, he took advantage of nobody. He never spoke an improper word, he never committed a wrong action. He never repented, never asked God for pardon and forgiveness.† He stood in no need of regeneration and conversion, nor even of reform, but simply of the regular harmonious unfolding of his moral powers. He exhibited a uniform elevation above the objects, opinions, pleasures and passions of this world, and disregard to riches, displays, fame and favor of men. The apparent outbreak of passion in the expulsion of the profane traffickers from the temple is the only instance on the record of his history which might be quoted against his freedom from the faults of humanity. But the very effect which it produced, shows that far from being the

† The petition for forgiveness in the Lord's Prayer, Matth. 6, 12, is no exception, as it was no expression of individual need on his part, but was intended as a model for his disciples.

outburst of passion, the expulsion was a judicial act of a religious reformer, vindicating in just and holy zeal the honor of the Lord of the temple, and that with a dignity and majesty which at once silenced the offenders, though superior in number and physical strength, and made them submit to their well deserved punishment without a murmur and in awe of the presence of a superhuman power. The cursing of the unfruitful fig tree can still less be urged, as it evidently was a significant symbolical act foreshadowing the fearful doom of the impenitent Jews in the destruction of Jerusalem.

The perfect innocence of Jesus, however, is based not only negatively on the absence of any recorded word or act to the contrary and his absolute exemption from every trace of selfishness and worldliness, but, positively also on the unanimous testimony of John the Baptist and the apostles who bowed before the majesty of his character in unbounded veneration and declare him "just," "holy," and "without sin."* It is admitted, moreover, by his enemies: the heathen judge Pilate, and his wife, representing as it were the Roman law and justice when they shuddered with apprehension and washed the hands to be clear of innocent blood; by the rude Roman centurion confessing under the cross in the name of the disinterested spectators, "Truly this was the Son of God," and by Judas himself, the immediate witness of his whole public and private life, exclaiming in despair: "I have betrayed innocent blood."† Even dumb nature responded in mysterious sympathy, and

---

* Acts 3, 14. 1 Peter 1, 19; 2, 22; 3, 18. 2 Cor. 5, 21; 1 John 2, 29; 3, 5. 7. Heb. 4, 15; 7, 26. Considering the infinite superiority of the ethics of the apostles to the ethics of the ancient Greeks it is absurd to weaken the force of this unanimous testimony (as is done by D. F. Strauss, *Die christliche Glaubenslehre*, Vol. II. p. 192, and to some extent even by Hase, Leben Jesu, p. 61), by a reference to Xenophon's estimate of Socrates: Οὐδείς πώποτε Σωκράτους οὐδὲν ἀσεβὲς οὐδὲ ἀνόσιον οὔτε πράττοντος εἶδεν, οὔτε λέγοντος ἤκουσεν. Memorab. I. 11. Comp. the just remarks of Ullmann, *Sündlosigkeit Jesu*, p. 83 ff.

† Matth. 27, 19; 24–54. Luke 23, 22–47. Matth. 27, 4.

the beclouded heavens above and the shaking earth beneath united in paying their unconscious tribute to the divine purity of their dying Lord. It is finally placed beyond all possibility of doubt by his own freedom from any sense of guilt or unworthiness, and by his open and fearless challenge to his bitter enemies: "Which of you convinceth me of sin?"‡ In this question he clearly exempts himself from the common fault and guilt of the race. In the mouth of any other man this question would at once betray either the hight of hypocrisy, or a degree of self-deception bordering on madness itself, and would overthrow the very foundation of all human goodness; while from the mouth of Jesus we instinctively receive it as the triumphant self-vindication of one, who stood far above the possibility of successful impeachment or founded suspicion.‖

Admit once this fact of the perfect sinlessness of Christ, as is done even by divines who are by no means regarded orthodox,§ and you admit that Christ differed from all other

‡ John 8, 46. Comp. the Commentators, and the reflections of Ullmann, l. c. p. 92 ff.

‖ Compare the striking remarks of H. Bushnell, p. 325: "If Jesus was a sinner, he was conscious of sin as all sinners are, and therefore was a hypocrite in the whole fabric of his character; realizing so much of divine beauty in it, maintaining the show of such unfaltering harmony and celestial grace, and doing all this with a mind confused and fouled by the affectations acted for true virtues! Such an example of successful hypocrisy would be itself the greatest miracle ever heard of in the world."

§ As Schleiermacher, *Der Christliche Glaube*, 3d ed. (1836) vol. ii. p. 78: "Christus war von allen andern Menschen unterschieden durch seine wesentliche Unsündlichkeit und seine schlechthinige Vollkommenheit." Karl Hase, *Leben Jesu*, 4th ed. 1854, p. 60 f. (Clarke's Eng. translation, Boston, 1860, p. 54) likewise admits it. D. F. Strauss denies it in his two destructive works, the *Life of Jesus*, and the *Dogmatics in conflict with Modern Science*, but he does so from the a priori philosophical argument of the impossibility of sinlessness, or the pantheistic notion of the inseparableness of sin from all finite existence. The only exegetical proof he urges (Dogmat. ii. 192), is Christ's word, Matth. 19, 17: "There is none good but one, that is God." But Christ answers here to the preceding question and the implied misconception of goodness. He does not decline the epithet *good* as such, but only in the superficial sense of the rich youth who regarded him simply as a distinguished rabbi and a good *man*, not as one with God. In no case can he be supposed to have contradicted his own testimony concerning his innocence. See the commentators *ad locum*, especially Olshausen, Meyer and Lange.

men not in degree only, but in kind. For although we must repudiate the pantheistic notion of the necessity of sin, and must maintain that human nature in itself considered is capable of sinlessness, that it was sinless in fact before the fall, and that it will ultimately become sinless again by the redemption of Christ: yet it is equally certain that human nature in its *present* condition is not and never was sinless since the fall, except in the single case of Christ, and that for this very reason Christ's sinlessness can only be explained on the ground of such an extraordinary indwelling of God in him as never took place in any other human being before or after. The entire Christian world, Greek, Latin, and Protestant, agree in the scriptural doctrine of the universal depravity of human nature since the apostacy of the first Adam. Even the modern and unscriptural Romish dogma of the freedom of the Virgin Mary from hereditary as well as actual sin, can hardly be quoted as an exception: for her sinlessness is explained in the papal decision by the assumption of a miraculous interposition of divine favor and the reflex influence of the merit of her Son. There is not a single mortal who must not charge himself with some defect or folly, and man's consciousness of sin and unworthiness deepens just in proportion to his self-knowledge and progress in virtue and goodness. There is not a single saint who has not experienced a new birth from above and an actual conversion from sin to holiness, and who does not feel daily the need of repentance and divine forgiveness. The very greatest and best of them, as St. Paul and St. Augustin, have passed through a violent struggle and a radical revolution, and their whole theological system and religious experience rested on the felt antithesis of sin and grace.

But in Christ we have the one solitary and absolute exception to this universal rule, an individual thinking like a man, feeling like a man, speaking, acting, suffering and dying like a man, surrounded by sinners in every direction, with the keenest sense of sin and the deepest sympathy with sinners, commencing his public ministry with the

call: "Repent, for the kingdom of heaven is at hand," *— yet never touched in the least by the contamination of the world, never putting himself in the attitude of a sinner before God, never shedding a tear of repentance, never regretting a single thought, word or deed, never needing or asking divine pardon, and boldly facing all his present and future enemies in the absolute certainty of his spotless purity before God and man!

A sinless Saviour in midst of a sinful world is an astounding fact indeed, and a miracle in history. But this freedom from the common sin and guilt of the race is after all only the negative side of his character, which rises in magnitude as we contemplate the positive side, namely, absolute moral and religious perfection. It is universally admitted, even by Deists and Rationalists, that Christ taught the purest and sublimest system of ethics, which throws all the moral precepts and maxims of the wisest men of antiquity far into the shade. The Sermon on the Mount alone is worth infinitely more than all that Confucius, Socrates, and Seneca ever said or wrote on duty and virtue. But the difference is still greater if we come to the more difficult task of practice. While the wisest and best of men never live up even to their own imperfect standard of excellency, Christ fully carried out his perfect doctrine in his life and conduct. He is the living incarnation of the ideal standard of virtue and holiness, and universally acknowledged to be the highest model for all that is pure and good and noble in the sight of God and man.

We find Christ moving in all the ordinary and essential relations of life,† as a son, a friend, a citizen, a teacher, at home and in public; we find him among all classes of society, with sinners and saints, with the poor and the wealthy, with the sick and the healthy, with little children, grown men and women, with plain fishermen and learned scribes,

---

* Matth. 4, 17.

† The relation of husband and father must be excepted on account of his elevation above all equal partnership and the universalness of his character and mission, which requires the entire community of the redeemed as his bride instead of any individual daughter of Eve.

with despised publicans and honored members of the Sanhedrim, with friends and foes, with admiring disciples and bitter persecutors, now with an individual as Nicodemus, or the woman of Samaria, now in the familiar circle of the twelve, now in the crowds of the people; we find him in all situations, in the synagogue and the temple, at home and on journeys, in villages and the city of Jerusalem, in the desert and on the mountain, along the banks of Jordan and the shores of the Galilean sea, at the wedding feast and the grave, in Gethsemane, in the judgment hall and on Calvary. In all these various relations, conditions and situations, as they are crowded within the few years of his public ministry, he sustains the same consistent character throughout, without ever exposing himself to censure. He fulfils every duty to God, to man, and to himself, without a single violation of duty, and exhibits an entire conformity to the law, in the spirit as well as the letter. His life is one unbroken service of God in active and passive obedience to his holy will, one grand act of absolute love to God and love to man, of personal self-consecration to the glory of the heavenly Father and the salvation of a fallen race. In the language of the people who were "beyond measure astonished at his works," we must say, the more we study his life: "He did all things well."* In a solemn appeal to his heavenly Father in the parting hour, he could proclaim to the world that he had glorified him in the earth and finished the work he gave him to do.†

The first feature in this singular perfection of Christ's character which strikes our attention, is the perfect harmony of virtue and piety, of morality and religion, or of love to God and love to man. Every moral action in him proceeded from supreme love to God, and looked to the temporal and eternal welfare of man. The groundwork of his character was the most intimate and uninterrupted

* Mark 7, 37: Καλῶς πάντα πεποίηκε, bene omnia fecit—is to be taken as a general judgment, inferred not only from the concrete case related before, but from all they had heard and seen of Christ.

† John 17; 8. 22.

union and communion with his heavenly Father, from whom he derived, to whom he referred every thing. Already in his twelfth year he found his life element and delight in the things of his Father.* It was his daily food to do the will of Him that sent him and to finish his work.† To him he looked in prayer before every important act, and taught his disciples that model prayer which, for simplicity, brevity, comprehensiveness and suitableness, can never be surpassed. He often retired to a mountain or solitary place for prayer, and spent days and nights in this blessed privilege. But so constant and uniform was his habit of communion with the great Jehovah, that he kept it up amid the multitude, and converted the crowded city into a religious retreat. His self-consciousness was at every moment conditioned, animated and impregnated by the consciousness of God. Even when he exclaimed in indescribable anguish of body and soul, and in vicarious sympathy with the misery of the whole race: "My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me!"‡ the bond of union was not broken or even loosened, but simply obscured for a moment, as the sun by a passing cloud, and the enjoyment, not the possession of it, was withdrawn from his feelings; for immediately afterwards he commended his soul into the hands of his Father and triumphantly exclaimed: "It is finished!" So strong and complete was this moral union of Christ with God at every moment of his life, that he fully realized for the first time the idea of religion whose object is to bring about such a union, and that he is the personal representative and living embodiment of Christianity as the true and absolute religion. But the piety of Christ was no inactive contemplation, or retiring mysticism, and selfish enjoyment, but thoroughly practical, ever active in works of charity, and tending to regenerate and transform the world into the kingdom of

* Luke 2, 49. † John 4, 34, comp. 5, 30.

‡ Matth. 27, 46. It should be remembered, that Jesus speaks here in the prophetical and typical words of David, Ps. 22, 2; while, when speaking in his own language, he uniformly addresses God as his *Father*.

God. "He went about doing good." His life is an unbroken series of good words and virtues in active exercise, all proceeding from the same union with God, animated by the same love, and tending to the same end, the glory of God and the happiness of man.

The next feature, we would notice, is the completeness or pleromatic fulness of the moral and religious character of Christ. While all other men represent at best but broken fragments of the idea of goodness and holiness, he exhausts the list of virtues and graces, which may be named.

History exhibits to us many examples of commanding and comprehensive geniuses, who stand at the head of their age and nation and furnish material for the intellectual activity of whole generations and periods, until they are succeeded by other heroes at a new epoch of development. As rivers generally spring from high mountains, so knowledge and moral power rises and is continually nourished from the heights of humanity. Abraham, the father of the faithful; Moses, the lawgiver of the Jewish theocracy; Elijah among the prophets; Peter, Paul and John among the apostles; Athanasius and Chrysostom among the Greek, Augustin and Jerome among the Latin fathers; Thomas Aquinas and Duns Scotus among the schoolmen; Leo and Gregory among the popes; Luther and Calvin in the line of protestant reformers and divines; Socrates, the patriarch of the ancient schools of philosophy; Homer, Dante, Shakspeare and Milton, Goethe and Schiller in the history of poetry among the various nations to which they belong; Raphael among painters; Charlemagne, the first and greatest in the long succesion of German emperors; Napoleon, towering high above all the generals of his training: Washington, the wisest and best as well as the first of American Presidents and the purest and noblest type of the American character, may be mentioned as examples of such representative heroes in history who anticipate and concentrate the powers of whole generations. But they never represent universal, but only sectional humanity; they are identified with a particular people or age and partake of its errors,

superstitions and failings almost in the same proportion in which they exhibit their virtues. Moses, though revered by the followers of three religions, was a Jew in views, feelings, habits and position as well as by parentage; Socrates never rose above the Greek type of character; Luther was a German to the back-bone and can only be properly understood as a German; Calvin, though an exile from his native land, remained a Frenchman; and Washington can be to no nation on earth what he is to the American. Their influence may and does extend far beyond their respective national horizon, yet they can never furnish a universal model for imitation. We regard them as extraordinary but fallible and imperfect men, whom it would be very unsafe to follow in every view and line of conduct. Very frequently the failings and vices of great men are in proportion to their virtues and powers, as the tallest bodies cast the longest shadow. Even the three leading apostles are models of piety and virtue only as far as they reflect the image of their heavenly Master, and it is only with this qualification that Paul exhorts his spiritual children: "Be ye followers of me even as I am also of Christ."*

What these representative men are to particular ages or nations, or sects, or particular schools of science and art, Christ was to the human family at large in its relation to God. He and he alone is the universal type for universal imitation. Hence he could, without the least impropriety or suspicion of vanity, call upon all men to forsake all things and to follow him.† He stands above the limitations of age, school, sect, nation, and race. Although a Jew according to the flesh, there is nothing Jewish about him which is not at the same time of general significance. The particular and national in him is always duly subordinated to the general and human. Still less was he ever identified with a party or sect. He was equally removed from the stiff formalism of the Pharisees, the loose liberal-

* 1 Cor. 11, 1. Comp. 1 Thess. 1, 6: "Ye became followers of us and of the Lord."

† Matth 4, 19. 8, 22. 9, 9 Mark 2, 14. 8, 34. 10, 21. Luke 5, 27. 9, 23. 59. 18. 22. John 1, 43. 10, 27. 12, 26.

ism of the Sadducees, and the inactive mysticism of the Essenes. He rose above all the prejudices, bigotries and superstitions of his age and people, which exert their power even upon the strongest and otherwise most liberal minds. Witness his freedom in the observance of the sabbath, by which he offended the scrupulous literalists, while he fulfilled, as the Lord of the sabbath, the true spirit of the law in its universal and abiding significance;‡ his reply to the disciples, when they traced the misfortune of the blind man to a particular sin of the subject or his parents;‖ his liberal conduct towards the Samaritans as contrasted with the inveterate hatred and prejudice of the Jews including his own disciples at the time;¶ and his charitable judgment of the slaughtered Galileans whose blood Pilate had mingled with their sacrifices, and the eighteen upon whom the tower in Siloam fell and slew them.** "Think ye," he addressed the children of superstition, "that these men were sinners above all the Galileans, and above all men that dwelt in Jerusalem, because they suffered such things? I tell you, Nay: but except ye repent, ye shall all likewise perish." All the words and all the actions of Christ, while they were fully adapted to the occasions which called them forth, retain their force and applicability undiminished to all ages and nations. He is the same unsurpassed and unsurpassable model of every virtue to the Christians of every generation, every clime, every sect, every nation, and every race.

It must not be supposed, however, that a complete catalogue of virtues would do justice to the character under consideration. It is not only the completeness, but still more the even proportion and perfect harmony of virtues and graces apparently opposite and contradictory, which

‡ Matth. 12, 1–8. Mark 2, 23.–28. Luke 5, 1–9. John 5, 16–18.

‖ John 9, 3: "Neither hath this man sinned, nor his parents, (but he was born blind) that the works of God should be made manifest in him."

¶See the dialogue with the woman of Samaria, John 4, 5 ff., and the parable of the merciful Samaritan, Luke 10, 30–37.

** Luke 13, 1–4.

distinguishes him specifically from all other men. This feature has struck with singular force all the more eminent writers on the subject."* It gives the finish to that beauty of holiness which is the sublimest picture presented to our contemplation.

He was free from all one-sidedness which constitutes the weakness as well as the strength of the most eminent men. He was not a man of one idea nor of one virtue towering above all the rest. The moral forces were so well tempered and moderated by each other that none was unduly prominent, none carried to excess, none alloyed by the kindred failing. Each was checked and completed by the opposite grace. His character never lost its even balance and happy equilibrium, never needed modification or readjustment. It was thoroughly sound and uniformly consistent from the beginning to the end. We cannot properly attribute to him any one temperament. He was neither sanguine, like Peter, nor choleric, like Paul, nor melancholic like John, nor phlegmatic as James is sometimes, though incorrectly, represented to have been, but he combined the vivacity without the levity of the sanguine, the vigor without the violence of the choleric, the seriousness without the austerity of the melancholic, the calmness without the apathy of the phlegmatic temperaments. He was equally far removed from the excesses of the legalist, the pietist, the ascetic, and the enthusiast. With the strictest obedience to the law he moved in the element of

---

* Comp. Ullmann, *Sundlosigkeit* p. 67, J. P. Lange, *Leben Jesu* I. 27–34, Ebrard, *Dogmatik* II. 23 and 24. Also Hase, in his *Leben Jesu* p. 63 (4th ed.) places the ideal beauty of Christ's character in "das schöne Ebenmaass aller Kräfte," and in "vollendete Gottesliebe dargestellt in reinster Humanität" ("the beautiful symmetry of all powers, and perfect love exhibited in purest humanity"). Bishop D. Wilson, in his *Evidences of Christianity*, vol. II. 116 (Boston ed. of 1830) remarks: "The opposite, and to us apparently contradictory graces were found in him in equal proportion." Dr. W. E. Channing, the Unitarian, in his sermon on the *Character of Christ* (Works, vol. IV. p. 23) says: "This combination of the spirit of humanity, in its lowliest, tenderest form, with the consciousness of unrivaled and divine glories, is the most wonderful distinction of this wonderful character."

freedom; with all the fervor of the enthusiast he was always calm, sober and self-possessed; notwithstanding his complete and uniform elevation above the affairs of this world, he freely mingled with society, male and female, dined with publicans and sinners, sat at the wedding feast, shed tears at the sepulchre, delighted in God's nature, admired the beauties of the lilies, and used the occupations of the husbandman for the illustration of the sublimest truths of the kingdom of heaven. His zeal never degenerated into passion or rashness, nor his constancy into obstinacy, nor his benevolence into weakness, nor his tenderness into sentimentality. His unworldliness was free from indifference and unsociability, his dignity from pride and presumption, his affability from undue familiarity, his self-denial from moroseness, his temperance from austerity. He combined child-like innocence with manly strength, all-absorbing devotion to God with untiring interest in the welfare of man, tender love to the sinner with uncompromising severity against sin, commanding dignity with winning humility, fearless courage with wise caution, unyielding firmness with sweet gentleness. He is justly compared with the lion in strength and with the lamb in meekness. He equally possessed the wisdom of the serpent and the simplicity of the dove. He brought both the sword against every form of wickedness, and the peace which the world cannot give. He was the most effective, and yet the least noisy, the most radical, and yet the most conservative, calm and patient of all reformers. He came to fulfil every letter of the law, and yet he made all things new. The same hand which drove the profane traffickers from the temple, blessed little children, healed the lepers, and rescued the sinking disciple; the same ear which heard the voice of approbation from heaven, was open to the cries of the woman in travail; the same mouth which pronounced the terrible woe on the hypocrites and condemned the impure desire and unkind feeling as well as the open crime, blessed the poor in spirit, announced pardon to the adulteress, and prayed for his murderers; the same eye which

beheld the mysteries of God and penetrated the heart of man shed tears of compassion over ungrateful Jerusalem, and tears of friendship at the grave of Lazarus. These are indeed opposite, yet not contradictory traits of character, as little as the different manifestations of God's power and goodness in the tempest and the sunshine, in the towering alps and the lily of the valley, in the boundless ocean and dew-drop of the morning. They are separated in imperfect men indeed, but united in Christ, the universal model for all.

Finally as all the active virtues meet in him, so he unites the active or heroic virtues with the passive and gentle. He is equally the highest standard of all true martyrdom.

No character can become complete without trial and suffering, and a noble death is the crowning act of a noble life. Edmund Burke said to Fox in the English Parliament: "Obloquy is a necessary ingredient of all true glory. Calumny and abuse are essential parts of triumph." The ancient Greeks and Romans admired a good man struggling with misfortune as a sight worthy of the gods. Plato describes the righteous man as one who without doing any injustice, yet has the appearance of the greatest injustice and proves his own justice by perseverance against all calumny unto death; yea he predicts that if such a righteous man should ever appear, he would be "scourged, tortured, bound, deprived of his sight, and after having suffered all possible injury nailed on a post."* No wonder that the ancient fathers saw in this remarkable passage an unconscious prophecy of Christ. But how far is this ideal of the great philosopher from the actual reality as it appeared three hundred years afterwards. The great men of this world, who rise even above themselves on inspiring occasions and boldly face a superior army, are often thrown off their equilibrium in ordinary life and grow impatient at trifling obstacles. Only think of Napoleon at the head of his conquering legions and at the helm of an empire, and

* Politia p. 74 sqq. ed. Ast. (Plat. Opera vol. IV.) p. 361 E. ed. Bip.

the same Napoleon after the defeat at Waterloo and on the island of St. Helena. The highest form of passive virtue attained by ancient heathenism or modern secular heroism is that stoicism which meets and overcomes the trials and misfortunes of life in the spirit of haughty contempt and unfeeling indifference, which destroys the sensibilities and is but another exhibition of selfishness and pride.

Christ has set up a far higher standard by his teaching and example, never known before or since, except in imperfect imitation of him. He has revolutionized moral philosophy and convinced the world that forgiving love to the enemy, holiness and humility, gentle patience in suffering and cheerful submission to the holy will of God is the crowning excellency of moral greatness. "If thy brother," he says, "trespass against thee seven times in a day, and seven times in a day turn again to thee, saying, I repent; thou shalt forgive him."* "Love your enemies, bless them that curse you, do good to them that hate you, and pray for them that despitefully use you and persecute you."† This is a sublime maxim truly, but still more sublime is its actual exhibition in his life.

Christ's passive virtue is not confined to the closing scenes of his ministry. As human life is beset at every step by trials, vexations, and hindrances, which should serve the educational purpose of developing its resources and proving its strength, so was Christ's. During the whole state of his humiliation he was "a man of sorrows and acquainted with grief,"‡ and had to endure "the contradiction of sinners."‖ He was poor, and suffered hunger and fatigue. He was tempted by the devil. His path was obstructed with apparently unsurmountable difficulties from the outset. His words and miracles called forth the bitter hatred of the world, which resulted at last in the bloody counsel of death. The Pharisees and Sadducees forgot their jealousies and quarrels in opposing him. They rejected and perverted his testimony; they laid snares to

* Luke 17, 4. † Matth. 5, 44. ‡ Isai. 50, 3. ‖ Heb 12, 3.

him by insiduous questions; they called him a glutton and a winebibber for eating and drinking like other men, a friend of publicans and sinners for his condescending love and mercy, a sabbath-breaker for doing good on the sabbath day; they charged him with madness and blasphemy for asserting his unity with the Father, and derived his miracles from Beelzebub, the prince of devils. The common people, though astonished at his wisdom and mighty works, pointed sneeringly at his origin; his own country and native town refused him the honor of a prophet. Even his brothers, we are told, did not believe in him, and in their impatient zeal for a temporal kingdom they found fault with his unostentatious proceeding.* His apostles and disciples, with all their profound reverence for his character and faith in his divine origin and mission as the Messiah of God, yet by their ignorance, their carnal Jewish notions and their almost habitual misunderstanding of his spiritual discourses, must have constituted a severe trial of patience to a teacher of far less superiority to his pupils.

But how shall we describe his passion more properly so called with which no other suffering can be compared for a moment! Never did any man suffer more innocently, more unjustly, more intensely, than Jesus of Nazareth. Within the narrow limits of a few hours we have here a tragedy of universal significance, exhibiting every form of human weakness and infernal wickedness, of ingratitude, desertion, injury and insult, of bodily and mental pain and anguish, culminating in the most ignominious death then known among the Jews and Gentiles. The government and the people combined against him who came to save them. His own disciples forsook him; Peter denied him; Judas, under the inspiration of the devil betrayed him. The rulers of the nation condemned him, the furious mob

* John 7, 3–5. It is immaterial for our purpose whether we understand by his brothers (not "brethren" as the Common Version has it) younger sons of Joseph and Mary, or older sons of Joseph from a former marriage, or cousins.

cried: "Crucify him!" rude soldiers mocked him. He was seized in the night, hurried from tribunal to tribunal, arrayed in a crown of thorns, insulted, smitten, scourged, spit upon and hung like a criminal and a slave between two robbers and murderers!

How did Christ bear all these little and great trials of life, and the death on the Cross? Let us remember first, that unlike the icy Stoics, in their unnatural and repulsive pseudo-virtue, he had the keenest sensibilities and the deepest sympathies with all human grief, that made him even shed tears at the grave of a friend and in the agony of the garden, and provide a refuge for his mother in the last dying hour. But with this truly human tenderness and delicacy of feeling, he ever combined an unutterable dignity and majesty, a sublime self-control and imperturbable calmness of mind. There is a grandeur in his deepest sufferings, which forbids a feeling of pity and compassion on our side as incompatible with the admiration and reverence for his character. We feel the force of his words to the women of Jerusalem, when they bewailed him on the way to Calvary: "Weep not for me, but weep for yourselves and your children," &c. We never hear him break out in angry passion and violence, although he was at war with the whole ungodly world. He never murmured, never uttered discontent, displeasure or resentment. He was never disheartened, discouraged, ruffled or fretted, but full of unbounded confidence that all was well ordered in the providence of his heavenly Father. He moved serenely like the sun above the clouds as they sailed under him. He was ever surrounded by the element of peace, and said in his parting hour: "Peace I leave with you, my peace I give unto you: not as the world giveth, give I unto you. Let not your heart be troubled, neither let it be afraid." * He was never what we call unhappy, but full of inward joy which he bequeathed to his disciples in that sublimest of all prayers, "that they might have his joy fulfilled in

* John 14, 27.

themselves." † With all his severe rebuke to the Pharisees, he never indulged in personalities. He ever returned good for evil. He forgave Peter for his denial, and would have forgiven Judas, if in the exercise of sincere repentance he had sought his pardon. Even while hanging on the cross, he had only the language of pity for the wretches who were driving the nails into his hands and feet, and prayed in their behalf: "Father forgive them, for they know not what they do." He did not seek or hasten his martyrdom, like many of the early martyrs of the Ignatian type in their morbid enthusiasm and ambitious humility, but quietly and patiently waited for the hour appointed by the will of his heavenly Father. But when it came, with what self-possession and calmness, with what strength and meekness, with what majesty and gentleness did he pass through its dark and trying scenes! Here every word and act are unnutterably significant, from the agony in Gethsemane, when overwhelmed with the sympathetic sense of the entire guilt of mankind, and in full view of the terrible scenes before him—the only guiltless being in the world—he prayed that the cup might pass from him, but immediately added: "Not my, but thy will be done," to the triumphant exclamation on the cross: "It is finished!" Even his dignified silence before the tribunal of his enemies and the furious mob, when "as a lamb dumb before his shearers he opened not his mouth," is more eloquent than any apology, and made Pilate tremble. Who will venture to bring a parallel from the annals of ancient or modern sages, when even a Rousseau confessed: "If Socrates suffered and died like a philosopher, Christ suffered and died like a God!" The passion and crucifixion of Jesus, like his whole character, stands without a parallel, solitary and alone in its glory, and will ever continue to be what it has been for these eighteen hundred years, the most sacred theme of meditation, the highest exemplar of suffering virtue, the strongest weapon

† John 17, 13, comp. 16, 33.

against sin and Satan, the deepest source of comfort to the noblest and best of men.

Such was Jesus of Nazareth—a true man in body, soul and spirit, yet differing from all men, a character abolutely unique and original from tender childhood to ripe manhood, moving in unbroken union with God, overflowing with the purest love to man, free from every sin and error, innocent and holy, teaching and practising all virtues in perfect harmony, devoted solely and uniformly to the noblest ends, sealing the purest life with the sublimest death, and ever acknowledged since as the one and only perfect model of goodness and holiness! All human greatness loses on closer inspection; but Christ's character grows more and more pure, sacred and lovely, the better we know him. No biographer, moralist, or artist can be satisfied with any attempt of his to set it forth. It is felt to be infinitely greater than any conception or representation of it by the mind, the tongue and the pencil of man or angel. We might as well attempt to empty the waters of the boundless sea into a narrow well, or to portray the splendor of the risen sun and the starry heavens with ink. No picture of the Saviour, though drawn by the masterhand of a Raphael, or Dürer, or Rubens; no epic, though conceived by the genius of a Dante, or Milton, or Klopstock, can improve on the artless narrative of the gospel, whose only but all-powerful charm is truth. In this case certainly truth is stranger and stronger than fiction, and speaks best for itself without comment, explanation and eulogy. Here and here alone the highest perfection of art falls short of the historical fact, and fancy finds no room for idealizing the real. For here we have the absolute ideal itself in living reality. It seems to me that this consideration alone should satisfy the reflecting mind that Christ's character, though truly natural and human, must be at the same time truly supernatural and divine.

The whole range of history and fiction furnishes no parallel to such a character. There never was any thing even

approaching to it before or since, except in faint imitation of his example. It cannot be explained on purely human principles, nor derived from any intellectual and moral forces of the age in which he lived. On the contrary it stands in marked contrast to the whole surrounding world of Judaism and heathenism, which present to us the dreary picture of internal decay, and which actually crumbled into ruin before the new moral creation of the crucified Jesus of Nazareth. He is the one absolute and unaccountable exception to the universal experience of mankind. He is the great central miracle of the whole gospel history, and all his miracles are but the natural and necessary manifestations of his miraculous person performed with the same ease with which we perform our ordinary daily works.

There is but one rational explanation of this sublime mystery, and this is found in Christ's own testimony concerning his superhuman and divine origin.* This testimony challenges at once our highest regard and belief from the absolute veracity which no one ever denied him or could deny without destroying at once the very foundation of his universally conceded moral purity and greatness.

Christ strongly asserts his humanity, and calls himself, in innumerable passages, the Son of man.† This expression, while it places him in one view on common ground with us as flesh of our flesh and bone of our bone, already indicates at the same time that he is more than an ordinary individual, not merely *a* son of man like all other descendants of Adam, but *the* Son of man, the man in the highest sense, the ideal, the universal, the absolute man, the second Adam descended from heaven, the head of a new and superior order of the race, the King of Israel, the Messiah. The same is the case with the cognate term, "the Son of David," which

* For a very full exposition of this testimony, we refer to the instructive and able work of W. Fr. Gess: *Die Lehre von der Person Christi entwickelt aus dem Selbstbewusstsein Christi und aus dem Zeugnisse der Apostel.* Basel, 1856.

† Comp. the Dictionaries, and especially Schmid's and Bagster's Greek Concordances of the N. T. (the latter republished by the Harpers, N. York, 1855) sub. v. υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου.

is frequently given to Christ, by the two blind men, the Syrophenician woman, and the people at large.* The appellation does not express then, as many suppose, the humiliation and condescension of Christ simply, but his elevation rather above the ordinary level and the actualization in him and through him of the ideal standard of human nature under its moral and religious aspect or in its relation to God. This interpretation is suggested grammatically by the use of the definite article, and historically by the origin of the term in Daniel 7, 13, where it signifies the Messiah as the head of a universal and eternal kingdom. It commends itself moreover at once as the most natural and significant in such passages as: "Ye shall see the heaven open, and the angels of God ascending and descending upon the Son of man"; † "He that came down from heaven, even the Son of man which is in heaven"; ‡ "The Son of man hath power on earth to forgive sins"; § "The Son of man is Lord even of the sabbath day"; ‖ "Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of man, and drink his blood, ye have no life in you"; ¶ "The Son of man shall come in the glory of his Father"; ** "The Son of man is come to save"; †† "The Father hath given him authority to execute judgment also, because he is the Son of man". ‡‡ Even those passages which are quoted for the opposite view, receive, in our interpretation, a greater force and beauty from the sublime contrast which places the voluntary condescension and humiliation of Christ in the most striking light, as when he says: "Foxes have holes, and birds of the air have nests; but the Son of man hath not where to lay his head"; §§ or, "Whosoever will be chief among you, let him be your servant: even as the Son of man came not to be ministered unto, but to minister and to give his life a ransom for many." ‖‖ Thus the

* Matth. 9, 27. 15, 22. 12, 23. 21, 9. 22, 41ff., etc.

† John 1, 51 (or v. 52 in the Greek text and the German version).

‡ John 3, 13. § Matth. 9, 6. Mark 2, 10. ‖ Matth. 12, 8. Mark 2, 28. ¶ John 6, 53.

** Matth 16, 17, comp. 19, 28. 24, 30. 25, 31. 26, 64. Luke 21, 27. 36.

†† Matth. 18, 11, comp. Luke 19, 10. ‡‡ John 5, 27. §§ Luke 9, 58.

‖‖ Matth. 20, 27. 28.

manhood of Christ, rising far above all ordinary manhood, though freely coming down to its lowest ranks with the view to their elevation and redemption, is already the portal of his godhood.

But he calls himself at the same time, as he is most frequently called by his disciples, "the Son of God" in an equally emphatic sense. He is not merely *a* Son of God among others, angels, archangels, princes and judges, and redeemed men, but *the* Son of God as no other being ever was, is, or can be, all others being sons or children of God only by derivation or adoption after a new spiritual birth, and in dependance on his absolute and eternal Sonship.* He is, as his favorite disciple calls him, the "Only begotten Son," or, as the old Catholic theology expresses it, eternally begotten of the substance of the Father. In this high sense the title is freely given to him by his disciples,† without a remonstrance on his part, and by God the Father himself at his baptism and at the transfiguration.‡ Christ represents himself moreover as being not of this world, but sent from God, as having come from God, and as being in heaven while living on earth.§ He not only announces and proclaims the truth as other messengers of God, but declares himself to be the Light of the World;‖ the Way, the Truth, and the Life;¶ the Resurrection and the Life.** "All things," he says, "are delivered unto me of my Father, and no man knoweth the Son but the Father; neither knoweth any man the Father save the Son, and he to whomsoever the Son will reveal him."†† He invites the weary

* Matth. 11, 27. 21, 37. 22, 42. 26, 63 f. 27, 43. Mark 12, 6. 13, 32. 14, 62. Luke 10, 22. John 5, 19—26. 9, 35—38. 10, 36. 11, 4. 14, 13. 17, 1. 19, 7.

† Matth. 16, 16. Mark 3, 11. John 1, 18. 34. 49. 11, 27. 20, 31,—besides the many passages in the Acts and Epistles, where the term υἱὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ is as frequent as the term υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου in the Gospels.

‡ Matth. 3, 17. Luke 3, 22. Matth. 17, 5. Luke 9, 35.

§ John 3, 13. ‖ John 8, 12. ¶ John 14, 6. ** John 11, 25.

†† Matth 11, 27. This passage is a striking parallel to the sublimest sayings in the fourth gospel, and proves the essential identity of the Synoptic and the Johannean picture of Christ.

and heavy laden to come to him for rest and peace.* He promises life in the highest and deepest sense, even eternal life to every one who believes in him.† He claims and admits to be the Christ or the Messiah of whom Moses and the prophets of old testify, and the King of Israel.‡ He is the Lawgiver of the new and last dispensation, § the Founder of a spiritual kingdom coextensive with the race, and everlasting as eternity itself, ‖ the appointed Judge of the quick and the dead,¶ the only Mediator between God and man, the Saviour of the world.** He parts from his disciples with those sublime words which alone certify his divinity: "All power is given to me in heaven and in earth. Go ye, therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost: teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you: and, lo, I am with you alway, even to the end of the world." ††

Finally he claims such a relation to the Father, which implies both the equality of substance and the distinction of person, and which in connection with his declarations concerning the Holy Spirit leads with logical necessity, as it were, to the doctrine of the Holy Trinity. For this doctrine saves the Divinity of Christ and of the Holy Spirit without affecting the fundamental truth of the Unity of the Godhead, and keeps the proper medium between an abstract and lifeless monotheism and a polytheistic tritheism.

He always distinguishes himself from God the Father, who sent him, whose work he came to fulfil, whose will he

---

* Matth. 11, 28. † John 3, 36. 5, 24. 6, 40. 47. 50—58. 11, 25.

‡ John 4, 26. 5, 39. 46. Matth. 14, 33. 16, 16 f. 26, 63 f., etc.

§ Matth. 5, 22—44. 28, 19. 20.

‖ Matth. 16, 19. 27, 11. Luke 22, 30. John 18, 36. Comp. Dan. 7, 13. Luke 1, 33.

¶ John 5, 22. 25—27. Matth. 25, 31 ff., etc.

** Matth. 18, 11. Luke 9, 56. 19, 10. John 3, 17. 5, 34. 10, 9. 12, 47.—Comp. Luke 1, 47. 2, 11. John 4, 42, etc.

†† Matth. 28, 18—20.

obeys, by whose power he performs his miracles, to whom he prays, and with whom he communes as a self-conscious personal being. And so he distinguishes himself with equal clearness from the Holy Spirit, whom he received at his baptism, whom he breathed into his disciples and whom he promised to send and did send on them as the other paraclet, as the Spirit of truth and holiness with the whole fulness of the accomplished salvation. But he never makes a similar distinction between himself and the Son of God; on the contrary he identifies himself with the Son of God, and uses this term, as already remarked, in a sense which implies much more than the Jewish conception of the Messiah and nothing short of the equality of essence or substance. For he claims as the Son a real self-conscious preexistence before man and even before the world, consequently also before time—for time was created with the world. "Before Abraham was," he says, "I am"—* significantly using the past in the one, and the present in the other case to mark the difference between man's temporal and his own eternal mode of existence—, and in the sacerdotal prayer he asks to be clothed again with the glory which he had with the Father before the foundation of the world.† He assumes divine names and attributes as far as consistent with his state of humiliation, he demands and receives divine honors.‡ He freely and repeatedly exercises the prerogative of pardoning sin in his own name, which the unbelieving Scribes and Pharisees with a logic whose force is irresistible on their premises, looked upon as blasphemous presumption.‖ He familiarly classes himself with the infinite majesty of Jehovah in one common plural, and boldly declares: "He that hath seen me hath seen the

---

* John 8, 58.

† John 17, 5. Comp. the testimony of the apostles on the preexistence, John 1, 1–14. Col. 1, 16. Heb. 1, 2. 3.

‡ John 5, 23.

‖ Matth. 9, 6. Luke 5, 20–24. 7, 47. 48. § John 14, 9.

Father;"§ "I and the Father are one."* He coordinates himself, in the baptismal formula, with the Divine Father, and the Divine Spirit,* and allows himself to be called by Thomas in the name of all the apostles: "My Lord and my God!"†

These are the most astounding and transcendant pretensions ever set up by any being. He, the humblest and lowliest of man, makes them repeatedly and uniformly to the last in the face of the whole world, even in the darkest hour of suffering. He makes them not in swelling, pompous, ostentatious language, which almost necessarily springs from false pretensions, but in a natural, spontaneous style, with perfect ease, freedom and composure, as a native prince would speak of the attributes and scenes of royalty at his father's court. He never falters or doubts, never apologizes for them, never enters into an explanation. He sets them forth as self-evident truths which need only be stated to challenge the belief and submission of mankind.

Now suppose for a moment a purely human teacher, however great and good, suppose a Moses or Elijah, a John the Baptist, an apostle Paul or John—not to speak of any father, schoolman, or reformer—to say: "I am the Light of the world," "I am the Way, the Truth, and the Life," "I and the Father are one," and call upon all men: "Come unto me," "Follow me," that you may find "life" and "peace" which you cannot find elsewhere: would it not create a universal feeling of pity or indignation? No human being on earth could set up the least of these pretensions without being set down at once as a madman or a blasphemer.

But from the mouth of Christ these colossal pretensions excite neither pity nor indignation, nor even the least feeling of

* John 10, 30. The passage teaches certainly more than the ethical unity of will, it asserts according to the context the unity of power which is based on the unity of essence or the homousia. The ἓν excludes Arianism, the plural ἐσμὲν Sabellianism and Patripassianism.

† Matth. 28, 19.

‡ John 20, 28.

incongruity or impropriety. We read and hear them over and over again without surprise.* They seem perfectly natural and well sustained by a most extraordinary life and the most extraordinary works. There is no room here for the least suspicion of vanity, pride, or self-deception. For these eighteen hundred years these claims have been acknowledged by millions of people of all nations and tongues, of all classes and conditions, of the most learned and mighty as well as the most ignorant and humble with an instinctive sense of the perfect agreement of what Christ claimed to be with what he really was. Is not this fact most remarkable? Is it not a triumphant vindication of Christ's character and an irresistible proof of the truth of his pretensions?

There is no other solution of the mighty problem within the reach of human learning and ingenuity. Let us briefly review in conclusion the various attempts of Unitarians and unbelievers to account for the character of Christ without admitting his divinity.

The semi-infidelity of Socinians and Unitarians is singularly inconsistent. Admitting the faultless perfection of Christ's character and the truthfulness of the Gospel-history, and yet denying his divinity, they must either charge him with such egregious exaggerations and conceit as would overthrow at once the concession of his moral perfection, or they must so weaken and pervert his testimony concerning his relation to God as to violate all the laws of grammar and sound interpretation. Dr. W. E. Channing, the ablest and noblest reprepresentative of American Unitarianism, prefers to avoid the difficulty which he was unable to solve. In his admirable discourse on the Character of Christ he goes as far almost as any orthodox divine in vindicating to him the highest possible purity and excellency as a man,

* "Of all the readers of the Gospel," says Bushnell, p. 290, "it probably never even occurs to one in a hundred thousand, to blame his conceit, or the egregious vanity of his pretensions." Even the better class of Unitarians instinctively bow before these claims. See the remarkable passage of Dr. Channing quoted below.

but he stops half way and passes by in silence those extraordinary claims, which are inexplicable on merely human principles. He approaches, however, the very threshold of the true faith in the following remarkable passage which we have a right to quote against his own system. "I confess," he says, "when I can escape the deadening power of habit, and can receive the full import of such passages as the following,—'Come unto me, all ye that labor and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest,' —'I am come to seek and to save that which was lost,'— 'He that confesseth me before men, him will I confess before my Father in heaven,'—'Whosoever shall be ashamed of me before men, of him shall the Son of Man be ashamed when he cometh in the glory of the Father with the holy angels,'—'In my Father's house are many mansions; I go to prepare a place for you:'—I say, when I can succeed in realizing the import of such passages, I feel myself listening to a being, such as never before and never since spoke in human language. I am awed by the consciousness of greatness which these simple words express; and when I connect this greatness with the proofs of Christ's miracles which I gave you in a former discourse, I am compelled to exclaim with the centurion, 'Truly, this was the Son of God.'" But this is not all. We have seen that Christ goes much further than in the passages here quoted, that he forgives sins in his own name, that he asserts pre-existence before Abraham and before the world —not only ideally in the mind of God, for this would not distinguish him from Abraham or any other creature, but in the real sense of self-conscious personal existence—, that he claims and receives divine honors and attributes, and calls himself equal with the great Jehovah. How can a being so pure and holy, and withal so humble and lowly, so perfectly free from every trace of enthusiasm and conceit, as Dr. Channing freely and emphatically asserts Christ to have been, lay claim to any thing which he was not in fact.* Why then not also go beyond the exclamation of the heathen centurion, and unite with the con-

* Discourse on the *Character of Christ*, in Channing's Works, vol. IV. p. 20.

fession of Peter and the adoration of the skeptical St. Thomas: "My Lord and my God!" Unitarianism admits altogether too much for its own conclusions and is therefore driven to the logical alternative of falling back upon an infidel, or of advancing to the orthodox christology. Such a man as Channing, who was certainly under the influence of the holy example of Christ, would not hesitate for the choice, as we may infer from his general spirit and from his last address delivered at Lenox, Massachusetts in 1842, shortly before his death, where he said: "The doctrine of the Word made flesh shows us God uniting himself intimately with our nature, manifesting himself in a human form, for the very end of making us partakers of his own perfection."

The infidelity of the enemies of Christianity is logically more consistent, though absolutely untenable in the premises. It resorts either to imposture, or enthusiasm, or poetical fiction.

The hypothesis of *imposture* is so revolting to moral as well as common sense that its mere statement is its condemnation. It has never been seriously carried out, and no scholar of any decency and self-respect would now dare to profess it.† How, in the name of logic and experience, could an imposter, that is a deceitful, selfish, depraved man, have invented and consistently maintained from beginning to end the purest and noblest character known in history,

† It was first suggested by the heathen assailants of Christianity, Celsus and Julian the Apostate, then insinuated by French deists of the Voltairean school, but never raised to the dignity of scientific argument. The only attempt to carry it out, and that a mere fragmentary one, was made by the anonymous "*Wolfenbuettel Fragmentist*," since known as Hermann Samuel Reimarus, professor of oriental literature in the College at Hamburg, who died in 1786. His *Fragments* were never intended for publication, but only for a few friends. Lessing found them in the library at Wolfenbüttel and commenced to publish them, without the author's knowledge, in 1774, not, as he said, because he agreed with them, but because he wished to arouse the spirit of investigation. This mode of procedure Semler, the father of German neology, wittingly compared to the act of setting a city on fire for the purpose of trying the engines.

with the most perfect air of truth and reality? How could he have conceived and successfully carried through, in the face of the strongest prejudices of his people and age, a plan of unparalleled beneficence, moral magnitude and sublimity, and sacrified his own life for it? The difficulty is not lessened by shifting the charge of fraud from Christ upon the apostles and evangelists, who were any thing but designing hypocrites and deceivers, and leave upon every unsophisticated reader the impression of an artless simplicity and honesty rarely equalled and never surpassed by any writers learned or unlearned, of ancient or modern times. What imaginable motive could have induced them to engage in such a wicked scheme, when they knew that the whole world would persecute them even to death? How could they have formed and successfully sustained a conspiracy for such a purpose without ever falling out or betraying themselves by some inconsistent word or act? And who can believe that the Christian Church for these eighteen hundred years, now embracing nearly the whole civilized world, should have been duped and fooled by a Galilean carpenter or a dozen illiterate fishermen? Verily this lowest form of infidelity is the grossest insult to reason and sense and to the dignity of human nature.

The hypothesis of *enthusiasm* or self-deception, though less disreputable, is equally unreasonable in view of the uniform clearness, calmness, self-possession, humility, dignity and patience of Christ,—qualities the very opposite to those which characterize an enthusiast. We might imagine a Jew of that age to have fancied himself the Messiah and the Son of God, but instead of opposing all the popular notions, and discouraging all the temporal hopes of his countrymen, he would, like Barcochba of a later period, have headed a rebellion against the hated tyranny of the Romans and endeavored to establish a temporal kingdom. Enthusiasm, which in this case must have bordered on madness itself, instead of calmly and patiently bearing the malignant opposition of the leaders of the nation, would have broken out in violent passion and precipitate action.

"The charge," says Dr. Channing, "of an extravagant, self-deluding enthusiasm is the last to be fastened on Jesus. Where can we find the traces of it in his history? Do we detect them in the calm authority of his precepts; in the mild, practical, and beneficent spirit of his religion; in the unlabored simplicity of the language with which he unfolds his high powers, and the sublime truths of religion; or in the good sense, the knowledge of human nature, which he always discovers in his estimate and treatment of the different classes of men with whom he acted? Do we discover this enthusiasm in the singular fact, that whilst he claimed power in the future world, and always turned men's minds to Heaven, he never indulged his own imagination, or stimulated that of his disciples, by giving vivid pictures, or any minute description, of that unseen state? The truth is, that, remarkable as was the character of Jesus, it was distinguished by something more than by calmness and self-possession. This trait pervades his other excellences. How calm was his piety! Point me, if you can, to one vehement, passionate expression of his religious feelings. Does the Lord's Prayer breath a feverish enthusiasm? . . . His benevolence, too, though singularly earnest and deep, was composed and serene. He never lost the possession of himself in his sympathy with others; was never hurried into the impatient and rash enterprises of an enthusiastic philanthrophy; but did good with the tranquility and constancy which mark the providence of God."*

But the champions of this theory may admit all this, and yet fasten the delusion upon the disciples of Christ who were so dazzled by his character, words and works that they mistook an extraordinary man for a divine being, and extraordinary cures for supernatural miracles. This is the view of the older German rationalism (the so called *rationalismus communis, or vulgaris*†), and forms a parallel

---

* Discourse on the Character of Christ. Works, vol. IV. 17 and 18.

† Or the rationalism of common sense, as distinct from the rationalism of

to the heathen rationalism of Euhemerus, of the Cyrenaic school, who explained the gods of the Greek mythology as human sages, heroes, kings and tyrants, whose superior knowledge or great deeds secured them divine honors or the hero-worship of posterity.‡ It was fully developed, with a considerable degree of patient learning and acumen, by the late professor H. E. G. Paulus of Heidelberg.‖ He takes the gospel history as actual history, but by a critical separation of what he calls *fact* from what he calls *judgement* of the actor or narrator, he explains it exclusively from natural causes and thus brings it down to the level of every day events. This "natural" interpretation, however, turns out to be most unnatural and commits innumerable sins against the laws of hermeneutics and against common sense itself. To prove this it is only necessary to give some specimens from the exegesis of Paulus and his school. The glory of the Lord which, in the night of his birth, shone around the shepherds of Jerusalem, was simply an *ignis fatuus*, or a meteor; the miracle at Christ's baptism may be easily reduced to thunder and lightening and a sudden disappearance of the clouds; the tempter in the wilderness was a cunning Pharisee, and was only mistaken by the evangelists for the devil who does not exist except in the imagination of the superstitious; the supposed miraculous cures of the Saviour turn out on closer examination to be simply deeds either of philanthrophy, or medical skill, or good luck: the changing of

---

uncommon sense or speculative reason. The sense of both systems, however, ends is non-sense. Dr. Marheineke defined a Rationalist or, as Paulus called him, a *Denkfaulthier*, as a man, *der zu denken glaubt und zu glauben denkt; es ist aber mit beidem gleich null.* The Hegelian school has successfully ridiculed common rationalism and made every scholar of philosophical pretensions ashamed of it. But the infidel wing of that school has at last relapsed into the same or still greater absurdities.

‡ Comp. Diodorus Siculus, *Bibli. Fragm.* l. vii; Cicero, *De natura deor.* l. 42; Sextus Empir., *Adv. math.* ix. 17.

‖ Born in the kingdom of Würtemberg 1761, then successively professor in different universities, at last in Heidelberg, where he died in 1847, after having long outlived himself. His rationalistic exegesis is laid down in his *Commentary on the Gospels*, published since 1800, and his *Life of Jesus*, 1828.

water into wine was an innocent and benevolent wedding joke, and the delusion of the company must be charged on the twilight, not upon Christ; the daughter of Jairus, the youth of Nain, Lazarus, and Jesus himself, were raised not from real death, but simply from a trance or swoon; and the ascension of the Lord is nothing more than his sudden disappearance behind a cloud that accidentally intervened between him and his disciples! And yet these very evangelists, who must have been destitute of the most ordinary talent of observation and even of common sense, have contrived to paint a character and to write a story which in sublimity, grandeur and interest throws the productions of the proudest historians into the shade, and has exerted an irresistible charm upon Christendom for these eighteen hundred years! No wonder that those absurdities of a misguided learning and ingenuity hardly survived their author. It is a decided merit of Strauss that he has thoroughly refuted the work of his predecessor, and given it the death blow. But his own theory has shared no better fate.

The last hypothesis of a *poetical fiction* was matured and carried out with a high degree of ability and ingenuity by the speculative or pantheistic rationalism of David Frederick Strauss, the author of the famous *Life of Jesus.** This writer sinks the Gospel-history, as to the mode of its orgin and realness, substantially on a par with the ancient mythologies of Greece and Rome. Without denying altogether the historical existence of Jesus, and even admitting him to have been a religious genius of the first magnitude, he yet, from pantheistic premises and by a cold process of hypercritical dissection of the apparently contradictory accounts of the witnesses, resolves all the supernatural and miraculous elements of his person and history into myths, or imaginative representations of religious ideas in the form of facts which

* The *Leben Jesu* by Strauss, Dr. phil., who was born in 1806 and is still living, was first published 1835 at Tübingen in 2 volumes, and for the fourth, in all probability also for the last time in 1840. It was also translated into English by a Miss Evans.

were honestly believed by the authors to have actually occurred. The ideas symbolized in these facts are declared to be true in the abstract or as applied to humanity as a whole, but denied as false in the concrete or in their application to an individual. The authorship of the evangelical myths is ascribed to the primitive Christian society pregnant with Jewish Messianic hopes and kindled to hero worship by the appearance of the extraordinary person of Jesus of Nazareth whom they took to be the promised Messiah. But this theory is likewise surrounded by insurmountable difficulties. Who ever heard of a poem unconsciously produced by a mixed multitude and honestly mistaken by them all for actual history? How could the five hundred persons, to whom the risen Saviour is said to have appeared, dream the same dream at the same time, and then believe it as a veritable fact at the risk of their lives? How could a man like St. Paul submit his strong and clear mind and devote all the energies of his noble life to a poetical fiction of the very sect whom he once persecuted unto death? How could such an illusion stand the combined hostility of the Jewish and heathen world, and the searching criticism of an age of high civilization, and even of incredulity and skepticism? How strange that unlettered and unskilled fishermen, and not the philosophers and poets of classic Greece and Rome, should have composed such a grand poem and painted a character to whom Strauss himself is forced to assign the very first rank among all the religious geniuses and founders of religion!

The poets must in this case have been superior to the hero, and yet the hero is admitted to be the purest and greatest man that ever lived! Where are the traces of a fervid imagination and poetic art in the Gospel history? Is it not, on the contrary, remarkably free from all rhetorical and poetical ornament, from every admixture of subjective notions and feelings, even from the expression of sympathy, admiration and praise? The writers evidently felt that the story speaks best for itself and could not be improved by the art and skill of man. Their discrepancies,

which at best do not affect the picture of Christ's character in the least but only the subordinate details of his history, prove the absence of conspiracy, attest the honesty of their intention and confirm the general credibility of their account. Verily, the Gospel history, related with such unmistakable honesty and simplicity by immediate witnesses and their pupils, proclaimed in open day light from Jerusalem to Rome, believed by thousands of Jews, Greeks and Romans, sealed with the blood of apostles, evangelists and saints of every grade of society and culture, is better attested by external and internal evidence than any other history. The same negative criticism, which Strauss applied to the Gospels, would with equal plausibility destroy the strongest chain of evidence before a court of justice, and resolve the life of Socrates, or Charlemagne, or Luther, or, Napoleon into a mythical dream. The secret of the mythical hypothesis is the pantheistic denial of a personal living God and the a priori assumption of the impossibility of a miracle. In its details it is so complicated and artificial that it can not be made generally intelligible, and in proportion as it is popularized, it reverts to the vulgar hypothesis of intentional fraud from which it professed at the start to shrink back in horror and contempt.

With this last and ablest effort, infidelity seems to have exhausted its scientific resources. It could only repeat itself hereafter. Its different theories have all been tried and found wanting. One has in turn transplanted and refuted the other, even during the lifetime of their champions. They explain nothing in the end; on the contrary, they only substitute an unnatural for a supernatural miracle, an inextricable enigma for a revealed mystery. They equally tend to undermine all faith in God's Providence, in history, and ultimately in every principle of truth and virtue, and they deprive a poor and fallen humanity, in a world of sin, temptation and sorrow, of its only hope and comfort in life and in death.

Dr. Strauss, by far the clearest and strongest of all assailants of the Gospel-history, seems to have had a passing

feeling of the disastrous tendency of his work of destruction and the awful responsibility he assumed. "The results of our inquiry," he says in the closing chapter of his *Life of Jesus*, "have apparently annihilated the greatest and most important part of that which the Christian has been wont to believe concerning his Jesus, have uprooted all the encouragements which he has derived from his faith, and deprived him of all his consolations. The boundless store of truth and life which for eighteen hundred years have been the aliment of humanity, seems irretrievably devastated, the most sublime levelled with the dust, God divested of his grace, man of his dignity, and the tie between heaven and earth broken. Piety turns away with horror from so fearful an act of desecration, and strong in the impregnable self-evidence of its faith, boldly pronounces that—let an audacious criticism attempt what it will—all which the Scriptures declare and the Church believes of Christ, will still subsist as eternal truth, nor needs one iota of it to be renounced."* Strauss makes then an attempt, it is true, at a philosophical reconstruction of what he vainly imagines to have annihilated as a historical fact by his sophistical criticism. He professes to admit the abstract truth of the orthodox christology, or the union of the divine and human, but perverts it into a purely intellectual and pantheistic meaning. He refuses divine attributes and honors to the glorious head of the race, but applies them to a decapitated humanity. He thus substitutes, from pantheistic prejudice, a metaphysical abstraction for a living reality, a mere notion for a historical fact, a progress in philosophy and mechanical arts for the moral victory over sin and death, a pantheistic hero worship, or self-adoration of a fallen race, for the worship of the only true and living God, the gift of a stone for the bread of eternal life!†

---

* *Leben Jesu*, Schlussabhandlung, vol. ii., p. 663 (4th ed. of 1840).

† "In an individual," says Strauss, *Leben Jesu*, vol. ii. p. 710, "in one Godman the properties and functions which the church doctrine ascribes to Christ, contradict themselves; in the idea of the race they agree. *Humanity*

Humanity scorns such a miserable substitute, which has yet to give the first proof of any power for good, and which will probably never convert or improve a single individual. It must have a living head, a real Lord and Saviour from sin and death. With renewed faith and confidence it returns from the dreary desolations of a heartless infidelity and the vain conceits of a philosophy falsely so called, to the historical Christ, and exclaims with Peter: "Lord, where shall we go but to Thee, Thou alone hast words of eternal life, and we believe and are sure that Thou art the Son of God!"

Yes! There He lives, the Divine man and incarnate God, on the ever fresh and self-authenticating record of the Gospels, in the unbroken history of eighteen centuries, and in the hearts and lives of the wisest and best of our race. Jesus Christ is the most certain, the most sacred, and the most glorious of all facts, arrayed in a beauty and majesty which throws the "starry heavens above us and the moral law within us" into obscurity, and fills us

---

is the union of the two natures—the incarnate God, the infinite externalizing itself in the finite, and the finite spirit remembering its infinitude; it is the child of the visible mother and the invisible father, Nature and Spirit; it is the worker of miracles, in so far as in the course of human history the spirit more and more completely subjugates nature, both within and around man, until it lies before him as an inert matter of his activity; it is the sinless existence, for the course of its development is a blameless one; pollution cleaves to the individual only, and does not touch the race or its history. It is Humanity that dies, rises, and ascends to heaven; for from the negation of its natural life there ever proceeds a higher spiritual life; from the suppression of its limitation as a personal, national, and terrestial spirit, arises its union with the infinite spirit of the heavens. By faith in this Christ, especially in his death and resurrection, man is justified before God: that is, by the kindling within him of the idea of Humanity, especially by the negation of its natural and sensual aspects, the individual man partakes of the divinely human life of the species."—But the idea of the human and divine is no more contradictory in an individual than in the race. What is true in idea or principle, must also actualize itself or be capable of actualization in a concrete living fact. History teaches moreover that every age, every great movement, and every nation have their representative heads, who comprehend and act out the life of the respective whole. This analogy points us to a general representative head of the entire race, Adam in the natural, and Christ in the spiritual order. The divine humanity of Strauss is like a stream without a fountain, or like a body without a head.

truly with ever growing reverence and awe. He shines forth with the self-evidencing light of the noon-day sun. He is too great, too pure, too perfect to have been invented by any sinful and erring man. His character and claims are confirmed by the sublimest doctrine, the purest ethics, the mightiest miracles, the grandest spiritual kingdom, and are daily and hourly exhibited in the virtues and graces of all who yield to the regenerating and sanctifying power of his spirit and example. The historical Christ meets and satisfies our deepest intellectual and moral wants. Our souls, if left to their noblest impulses and aspirations, instinctively turn to him as the needle to the magnet, as the flower to the sun, as the panting hart to the fresh fountain. We are made for him, and "our heart is without rest until it rests in him." He commands our assent, he wins our admiration, he overwhelms us to humble adoration and worship. We cannot look upon him without spiritual benefit. We cannot think of him without being elevated above all that is low and mean, and encouraged to all that is good and noble. The very hem of his garment is healing to the touch; one hour spent in his communion outweighs all the pleasures of sin. He is the most precious and indispensable gift of a merciful God to a fallen world. In him are the treasures of true wisdom, in him the fountain of pardon and peace, in him the only substantial hope and comfort in this world and that which is to come. Without him history is a dreary waste, an inextricable enigma; with him it is the unfolding of a plan of infinite wisdom and love. He is the glory of the past, the life of the present, the hope of the future. Mankind could better afford to lose the whole literature of Greece and Rome, of Germany and France, of England and America, than the story of Jesus of Nazareth. Not for all the wealth and wisdom of this world would I weaken the faith of the humblest Christian in his Divine Lord and Saviour; but if, by the grace of God, I could convert a single skeptic to a childlike faith in him, who lived and died for me and for all, I would feel that I had not lived in vain.

P. S.

Art. II.—THE DIVINING ROD.*

Mankind must believe in the mysterious. From the earliest childhood, when the reasoning powers are but budding forth, to that period of life when the full enjoyment of these same powers gives him a wide command over the forces and products of nature, he has always a secret love of the mysterious—the hidden. Faith, either in the holy mysteries of a pure religion, or in the foul and obscene secrets of that which is false, will be found more or less present in his soul. And outside of *religious* faith, there will be a belief in the existence of beings gifted with supernatural powers who are either benefactors or tormentors of the human race: bright little fairies singing,

"Over hill, over dale,
Thorough bush, thorough briar,
Over park, over pale,
Thorough flood, thorough fire,
I do wander every where,
Swifter than the moones sphere
And I serve the fairy queen,
To dew her orbs upon the green,"

or shrewd and knavish sprites like him "called Robin Good-fellow:"

"That fright the maidens of the villagery;
Skim milk; and sometimes labour in the quern,
And bootless make the breathless housewife churn;
And sometime make the drink to bear no barm;
Mislead night-wanderers, laughing at their harm;"

rewarders of good children, like the St. Nicholas of Christmas eve who comes with his cornucopia of happiness for the little ones, bestowing brightness and joy on their expectant countenances, or punishers of the bad, like the Pelznickel

* Histoire du Merveilleux dans les Temps modernes par Louis Figuier. Tome Deuxieme. La Baguette Divinatoire. Paris, 1860.

of that same eve who carries a rod and all kinds of unpleasant instruments of punishment for those who have neglected duties, been unmindful of the claims of parental authority, and have not been "good children."

Connected, naturally, with such a belief, is the idea that the hidden forces of nature may be placed at the command of man, through some supernatural power, or through some means not explained by ordinary philosophical laws. This idea may develop itself in the form of magic incantations supposed to possess wonderful powers over the spirits of the earth and air, peculiar rites or processes which invest those performing them with special privileges not allowed to their brethren, or in the recognition of peculiar influences belonging to certain signs and symbols. Popular superstitions, as to lucky or unlucky days, also owe their origin to this love of the mysterious. These ideas and popular notions cannot, as a general thing, be traced back to their true ground. They have grown, from small beginnings, until their present form has been reached, partly through a natural development of the primitive idea, and partly through additions made from without. Some of them, however, are of such a character that we can trace them back to the starting point and study them through all the phases of their development. To this class belongs *the divining rod*, to which we propose to direct our attention at present. Although this has been employed by the impostor and knave, with the view of deceiving the credulous and unsuspecting, yet it is also found occasionally in the hands of the latter class themselves, and at times producing results which demand attention from men of science. It will not then be uninteresting or profitless, if we attempt to give an account of the origin and use of the divining rod in ancient times, its employment in the middle ages, and the attempted explanations of the phenomena attributed to its use in the hands of men asserted to be specially skillful.

The rod has been the symbol and type of authority from the earliest antiquity. Holy Writ and ancient mythology

furnish abundant proofs of this statement. The Psalms show that it was also employed, at times, as a symbol of protection,—Thy *rod* and thy staff they comfort me. However employed typically, it implied some supernatural power. A few examples will be allowed us by way of illustration—Christ is called "the rod of thy strength;" His power is called a *rod* of iron—"Thou shalt break them with a *rod* of iron,"—"He shall rule them with a *rod* of iron;" Job speaks of the wrath of God as a rod—"Let him take away his *rod* from me,"—"neither is the *rod* of God upon them;" Isaiah uses it as a means of showing the miraculous birth of the Saviour—"And there shall come forth a *rod* out of the stem of Jesse." It was employed as a means of producing miracles,—passing thus from a type into the means, which the Almighty used for the purpose of impressing certain truths on the hearts and minds of the favorite people. The latter, however, becoming unmindful of the fact that the power was not innate in the rod, soon began to use it in divination. Hosea says, "My people ask counsel at their stocks, and their staff declareth unto them;"—and the reference to divination in Ezekiel may justify the supposition that the rod was also referred to by that prophet—"For the king of Babylon stood at the parting of the way, at the head of the two ways, to use *divination;* he made his arrows bright, he consulted with images, he looked in the liver."

With the Romans the *caduceus* was the symbol of peace, as the spear was that of war. It was usually a rod with a representation of two snakes wound around it, the origin of which mythology asserts to have been the separation of two snakes, while fighting, by the rod of Mercury. The augurs, when dividing the heavens, in their divinations, always employed a crooked staff called *lituus*, described as incurvum et leviter a summo inflexum bacileum. This was first used by Romulus in the location of the imperial city,—and being found in the temple, after the destruction of Rome, it became a hallowed object in the eyes of the people. Livy speaks of its employment in the consecra-

tion of Numa Pompilius as the second king of Rome, who refused to accept the regal position until a consultation of the gods, through augury, should reveal their pleasure. The augur ascended a high mountain, "there having taken in his right hand a curved rod" and examined the different regions of the heavens, he besought Jupiter to make some signs which would indicate his approval of Numa as king, when the rod was placed on his head.

And from the ancient Hebrews, the Romans and Greeks, the use of the rod passed to other nations until, according to Taylor,* "a belief in the existence of divination, or the art of foretelling events, however variously manifested, appears to be, except among Christians, coextensive with a belief in the Divinity, from which it derives its name. On this account, the stoics considered the two propositions inseparable. *Sunt dî; ergo est Divinatio.*" Of course we do not claim that divination was always performed by means of the rod, but it was one of the most common methods, employed by those who wished to foretell events or to discover the hidden treasures of nature.

In modern times the use of the rod appears to have been reintroduced by the Germans, although the French for many years were very much excited on the subject and seem to have been carried away by an insane frenzy to experiment with the rod, not only for the purpose of discovering the treasures of the earth, but also streams of pure water, and even the traces of murderers and other gross violators of Divine and human laws. We avail ourselves freely in this article of the materials, which Dr. Figuier has brought together on this subject, believing that we are presenting for the first time, in English, much that is interesting as well as intensely curious.

The divining rod was employed by the Baroness de Beausoleil in revealing the metallic treasures of France. This noble lady devoted herself, in conjunction with her husband, to the study of metallurgy and mineralogy, expending in

* Occult Sciences, 291.

this study an enormous private fortune. With the view, however, of making the results of her investigations the more wonderful, she pretended that she employed divining rods of seven different kinds, which gave indications always of metals when concealed under the soil. The result of this was the arrest of herself and husband under the charge of sorcery, and their death in prison. She had announced the discovery of subterranean mineral waters, made simply by holding one of the rods in her hand when it would be attracted powerfully towards the ground, over the places where these were concealed. But errors must always grow. After her death *Royer* announced that the divining rod was adapted for the detection of all kinds of concealed articles,—and he claimed, that it was a matter of indifference as to the material out of which the rod was made. It might be of wood, gold, silver, ivory, the horns of beef or any other animal, even of a cabbage stalk. It would detect every thing, except such as were connected with the immaterial or spiritual world. This was a total change of qualities in the instrument. At first it was entirely used on account of its prophetic power as regards events, and "the moral attribute was the only quality of the divining rod." A few centuries have passed away, and its friends claim for it every thing *but* this moral attribute. Tempora mutantur, nos et mutamur in illis. Every fashion has its day, and when it disappears the disappearance is not final, but only for a little while. It will again show itself above the horizon, gradually advance until it reaches the zenith and then speedily sink into obscurity. This is true, not only of fashion as regards clothing and the manners of society, but also of superstitions and popular delusions. Towards the end of the seventeenth century, the rod is once more employed on account of its moral properties. The most remarkable pretender of this period was Jacques Aymar, whose history, in connection with the divining rod, is of sufficient interest to claim more than a passing notice.

Jacques Aymar's skill was called into requisition by the

authorities, who were endeavoring to ascertain the perpetrators of a double murder in the city of Lyons. The bodies of a wine merchant and his wife were found in the cellar of their shop, a bottle wrapped with straw and a bloody billhook by their sides. Appearances justified the idea, that a robbery of the shop had been committed by the party or parties, who had committed the murder. The officers of justice, being absolutely at fault as to any mode of tracing the criminals, were induced to ask the aid of Jacques Aymar, a native of the village of Dauphiny. These were the days, when torture was employed as a legal means of obtaining information in criminal cases, and there will hence be no cause of wonder that the divining rod was employed by legal authority. The operator offered to undertake the investigation provided he was first brought to the place where the murder was committed, so that he might take the impression (*prendre son impression*). Guided by the prosecuting attorney, he visited the wine merchant's cellar, having placed between his hands a rod of the first kind of wood that he could find. "The rod remained immovable until the moment when he passed over the spot, where the corpse of the wine merchant had been found. Then it became violently agitated; he himself very much affected and his pulse was accelerated as though he were in a fever. This excitement increased, when he came to the spot where the corpse of the second victim had been found. Having thus received *his impression*, Aymar left the cellar, and, guided by his rod, or rather by the inner feeling which made it move, he ascended into the shop through which the assassins had taken flight. Leaving the shop, he followed, street after street, the tracks of the murderers; entered the court of the archbishop, crossed it, and only stopped at the gate by the Rhone, which was closed, because this fantastic perquisition was executed at night." He commences his operations, the next morning. Leaving Lyons by the bridge over the Rhone, he descends the right bank of the river. His rod at times informs him there were three, and again only two, associated in the

atrocious crime. He enters a gardener's house, and there declares that there were three assassins, and that they had been in that house. Accompanied by proper officers, he descended the Rhone, and, after many marvellous revelations by the rod, detects one of the assassins in a prison at Beaucaire. This man admitted that he was present when the murder was committed, but denied that he had been engaged in it. The prisoner was brought to Lyons, to the great satisfaction of the magistrates, and the enthusiastic admiration of the people. A new escort was furnished Aymar and he was again started off on his curious investigation. At Toulon, however, he was obliged to give it up. The man arrested was duly condemned to be broken alive on the wheel, and the sentence was carried out August 30, 1692.

This whole account seems to belong to some dark period of history, or to some nation not yet visited by the light of civilization. But unless the most indubitable evidence were furnished us, that it had occurred at the time mentioned, human credulity would not admit it a possible occurrence so near our era. "The virtue of the divining rod, so long considered a mere popular superstition, had been recognized as a juridical verity." Figuier thus deprives the whole affair of all supernatural character: "Aymar had evidently obtained some important data as to the murder. * * It is possible that he may have learned from his friend, who lived near the victims, that a hunchback had been seen among the men prowling around the house on the day of the crime." This was a hint which he followed up until the result was attained of seizing a hunchback in a prison, who made the confession. "What is extraordinary is the confession made by the prisoner, a confession which his extreme youth and his strong belief in the power of the rod may explain. It is probable, however, that without this confession, the judges would have hesitated to pronounce sentence of death, and that this affair would not have had the reputation it received and would not have conferred so great honor on the infallibility of the divining

rod." It was one of those occurrences, where accident, or rather Providence, had lead the hands of justice, by means altogether in themselves inadequate, to the detection of the perpetrator of a gross crime.

Attention having been turned towards the divining rod by the affair at Lyons, physicians began to experiment and physicists to denounce while the people, ever ready to grasp at the mysterious, gave their hearty credence to the asserted powers of the rod. Some experiments, made in the presence of and by Pauthot—Dean of the College of Medicine at Lyons,—furnished results that exhibited the extraordinary effects of the use of the rod in their true light. Whenever Aymar passed over the place, where the dead bodies had been found, he was seized with violent convulsions, and the rod was so forcibly bent towards the ground that it appeared ready to break. When the same rod was placed in the hands of another person, *not* a physician and *not* accustomed to cool examination of phenomena, effects very similar, to those shown in Aymar's person, made their appearance. But when Pauthot took the rod in his hands, all these effects were not apparent. It remained *immovable* although he passed frequently over the place where the bodies had been found, and no agitation was experienced in his system. We begin to see how the imagination or "the involuntary connivance of the spirit might act in the production of such phenomena."

In the year 1698 the fame of Jacques Aymar, who was actively employed in the interim in bemystifying his neighbors and living on the reputation obtained from the case we have related, was summoned to Paris by the Prince of Condé to exhibit some of his marvellous powers in his presence. Apartments were assigned him with the Concierge of the hotel, in order that he might be under the eye of the Prince himself. But here began Aymar's downfall. He was taken one day to the garden. Five holes had previously been made and in them gold and silver, copper and stones were respectively placed. The diviner, with his rod, pretended not only that he could detect

metals, but that he could distinguish them from one another. "When he was put to the test, he failed to detect anything, once declaring the existence of precious metals in the hole containing stones and at another time in one that was absolutely empty."

Test after test was now applied by the Prince of Condé. No results were obtained of the character promised by Aymar, and the Prince, being satisfied of the true character of the ignorant pretender, informed the public that Aymar's rod "was nothing but a pure illusion and a chimerical invention." There was no longer any chance for the employment of the divining rod in Paris, and Aymar retired to Lyons where a willing people still received his revelations as truths, and fabricated all kinds of excuses for his mistakes.

He next makes his appearance, on the page of history, in the capacity of detector of Protestants, in the war waged against them by the Marshal Montrevel. The rod was employed to indicate such persons as had attended protestant meetings. Being directed towards an individual suspected, if the suspicion was founded on fact it would immediately turn, and such an individual was consigned to the gibbet or the wheel. How many lives were sacrificed in this way through the rage of sectarian zeal, aided by an ignorant pretender, we are not able to state. The mind grows weary of dwelling upon such scenes, and history gives us nothing more of Aymar. He proved to be as useful to the murderous bigotry of his co-religionists, as he had been to the wonder-lovers and prodigy-seekers in the city of Lyons.

The fame acquired by Aymar in Dauphiny proved to be very attractive to the good people of that province. Many followers were raised up, who rivalled Aymar in their pretensions and were doubtless as reliable in their divinations. The rod was the judge of all questions under examination. "It revealed metals and springs, robbers and unreliable debtors;" furnished indications concerning concealed relics of the saints or property purloined from sinners, determined the value of horses exposed to sale and the true owner-

ship of lands; indeed its applications were as numerous as the wants of mankind. Every native of Dauphiny employed it, "men and women, children and old people, clergy and laity, all practised divination with the rod, despite pastoral mandates and instructions." All the marvellous effects were attributed to satanic agency. When this belief once took hold of the people, it proved particularly distressing to those who had been distinguished for their skill in the use of the rod, and they devoted themselves to prayers to the Almighty to withdraw the diabolical gift, and these always had the effect of freeing them immediately. The true connection between the will or the intention of the operator and the movement of the rod is clearly shown in the fact, that whenever a great desire was experienced to get rid of the power of moving the rod, it was always followed by a loss of this power.

Prominent among the employers of the divining rod, after Aymar, was Barthélemy Bleton who employed it as a hydroscope, or a means of detecting wells or springs of water. His mode of operating was by holding the rod between the first fingers of his two hands; when he passed over a subterranean collection of water, he was seized with a febrile agitation, and there was a downward movement of the rod. Dr. Thouvenel made a series of experiments with Bleton about the year 1780. It was pretended that he could detect subterranean springs, even when his eyes were bandaged and his arms held by one or more persons. Thouvenel, believing the revelations of Bleton, attempted their explanation by an electrical theory, which explains nothing at all. Bleton was invited to Paris in 1782. Lalande, the great astronomer, showed that the movements of the rod were the result of practice, which enabled Bleton to move the rod without showing any movement of his body. The accounts of his experiments are very contradictory. The journals were divided on this subject into *Bletonians* and *Anti-bletonians*, and partizan feeling ran so high that one finds it difficult to select that which is reliable from their statements. His friends asserted that he

could always find water, although he *might* mistake its depth and volume. This was an excellent subterfuge, as it enabled the *hydroscopist* to say, in case water was not found, on digging to a moderate depth, that it would be found if the well was only made deeper. His friends, and the credulous Thouvenel, alleged that he had made no mistake in eight hundred experiments. Yet a number of chemists report, that he had passed frequently through an alley, under which a pipe, two inches in width, containing water was laid, without any alteration in the direction of the rod, while he declared that canals and springs were concealed under the church of St. Geneviève. The latter blunder was readily explained by the statement that a current of moist air had produced the same effect as a current of subterranean water. But explanations and excuses are never very difficult to an ingenious, crafty man.

In 1790, Thouvenel having emigrated to Italy, found another Dauphinese, Pennet, who pretended to the same hydroscopic powers as Bleton. Spallanzani, the great physiologist, had been astonished at first by Pennet's apparent powers, but more deliberate examinations satisfied him that they were but apparent and not real. The savans of Italy were however very much divided in their opinions on the subject of the powers of the divining rod. Some attempted to explain, what they believed to be facts, by the supposed action of electric currents. This was at the time when the discoveries of Galvani and Volta, on the subject of the physiological effects of electricity, had attracted the attention of students of medical and physical science. But the use of the word electricity was then, as too frequently now, merely the resort of ignorance. Whenever a phenomenon was dark or mysterious, it was referred to the agency of electricity, without the slightest effort being made to show how there could be the relation of cause and effect between it and the phenomenon. Ignorance or limited knowledge always thus jumps to conclusions, without employing any intermediate reasoning. The appearance of a comet in the heavens is to him, who is innocent of any

knowledge of astronomy, the direct or remote cause of all present disasters, failure of crops, destructive wars, epidemic diseases among men and beasts, commercial troubles, and all possible evils that may afflict humanity. There is nothing on which our reasoning is so very loose and faulty, as on the relation of cause to effect. A sequence is accepted as a consequence, and a high-sounding term at once becomes sufficient, to explain any marvellous occurrence, to those whose minds have not been carefully trained in a strict school of logic.

The result of the general excitement in Italy, on the subject of the divining rod as a hydroscope, was precisely the same as in France and Germany. "Savants could not agree as to the value of experiments, even when they were most successful. There were enthusiastic affirmations and obstinate negations, sudden conversions and audacious denials,—and afterwards a dense melée of written statements, reports, journal articles, panegyrics and diatribes."

In England and America no general interest has ever been excited on this subject, although some very singular results have been apparently obtained by a few individuals, whose honesty and integrity could not for a moment be suspected. In this investigation, as in investigations of all mysterious and inexplicable phenomena, which seem to set at defiance the special laws of nature, we must distinguish between the honest experimenter who may be self-deceived, and the mere charlatan who employs his own ingenuity and skill for the deception of others. The two *cannot* be classed together, although the results obtained may be precisely alike. The second has availed himself of the credulity of mankind, with the view of gaining notoriety, or, which is more frequently the case, of filling his coffers. The first honestly tries to free himself from prejudice,—labors to benefit his fellow-men by what he supposes to be a real power in his possession, and is fully entitled to our respect for his motives and his sincerity, however erroneous we may find his conclusions. The second deserves no

mercy at our hands, and when the deception is detected, is fully entitled to all the scorn that is an imposter's due.

Let us now, having thus described in a brief and condensed way some of the most striking instances of the employment of the divining rod, direct our attention to an examination of its nature, the manner of its employment, the various theories that have been advanced as to the cause of its action by different classes of experimenters, and the explanations which modern science furnish us at the present time. In this way we shall best be enabled to derive important information on the subject, and to strip it of all marvellous character. We are probably in possession of such knowledge as to justify the belief, that the time has arrived for such clear and deliberate examination, as the excited prejudices of the past would not allow our predecessors.

As to the material of which the divining rod was composed, there was much difference of opinion among those who employed it. Agricola—a writer on metallurgy in the seventeenth century—mentions the use of hazel as specially adapted for the detection of silver, ash for copper, pine for lead, iron for gold.* The willow, elm and ash were employed at times in default of the hazel. Some insisted upon the almond tree, because the rod of Aaron which had been placed in the temple, "had brought forth buds, and bloomed blossoms, and yielded almonds," although they did not deign to show how there could be a connection between the manifestation of the Almighty's selection of the tribe of Levi to conduct "the priest's office for everything of the altar," and the search after precious metals. But, whatever wood was selected, it was necessary that it should be light and very porous, as it was presumed that its movement over the substances sought for was in consequence of the liquids it contained. The nature of the wood was, however, considered of very little importance by

* Etenim coryli virgulas adhibent ad venas argenti: fraxini, ad aeris: picastri, ad plumbi, maxime candidi: ex ferro vel acie ferri factas, ad auri.
Agricola, De Re Metallica, 26.

the Dauphinese diviners, in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. As we have already remarked, a cabbage stalk proved quite as effective as a rod of any of those woods, which were at first considered only available for divining purposes. As the rod could be of any material whatever, all questions concerning the relation between nature and properties were then settled, or at least considered as of no importance.

The rod was forked at one end. It was prepared by the German miners, by being exposed to certain cabalistic rites; or prayers were offered up, invoking a blessing on the rod. It was to be cut off at one stroke of the knife, at the rising of the sun on a Wednesday morning. Some claimed that it should be cut in the wet months, and others during dry seasons. That it should be forked, was not absolutely necessary, according to Agricola, for he says, "although the forked form may be employed, yet that is not of importance, for it may be straight or of any other shape, —the figure is of no importance, but the incantations, which he is not allowed, and does not wish, to narrate.* Most operators, according to Figuier, "selected a forked rod, or one at least having a crook at one of its ends; some, in accordance with the German method, took a small straight rod, a single shoot, without knots, divided into two, and making a hole in the end of one of the pieces, trimmed the other to a point and stuck it in this hole, making a jointed rod—*fuseau magique*. The great diviners, however, especially those of later times, used a straight rod, without bend or crook, a little curved about the middle, or perfectly straight."

The mode of holding the rod also differed. When a forked rod was used, it was seized by both hands, so that

* Virgula divina, quâ incantatores scrutantur venas, aut annulis etiam, speculis, cristallis, quamvis forma furcæ figurari possit, nihil tamen ad rem interest, recta sit, an in aliam figuram formata: non enim valet virgulæ figura, sed incantamenta carminum, quæ mihi commemorare non licet neque libet.

De Re Metallica 27.

the back part of the latter was towards the ground. Of course with the jointed and straight rods, different methods of holding these would be adopted. Agricola suggests that they should be held gently, not too gently, however, since in that case they would fall toward the earth, even before the power of the hidden metallic veins would act upon them; and if they were held too tightly, the strength of the hands would overcome the attractive force of the objects sought. He gives a wood cut representing two diviners with forked rods in their hands, looking as grave and dignified, as became their occupation. The character of the operator seems to have been of some account, and to have influenced very much the motions of the rod—Virgula igitur, in auriinveniendis venis, *viro bono gravique* usu iesse potest. Cicero wondered if soothsayers could look each other in the face without indulging in smiles at the tricks and deceptions they had been engaged in playing on their fellow citizens. But the soothsayers had even more excuse for their mode of procedure than some of the charlatans, who have figured with the divining rod. It is difficult so to transplant ourselves from the incredulous present into the credulous past, as to picture to our minds the astonished expressions of the people, when watching the movements of the employer of the divining rod, they would suddenly see it dipping towards the ground, and hear the oracle declare, with all the appearance of authority, the nature of the substance concealed at that spot. Goldsmith's description, of the effect of the old schoolmaster's learning on the villagers, may possibly give us a picture of the effect produced by such a sight;

> "Words of learned length and thundering sound
> Amaz'd the gazing rustics rang'd around,
> And still they gaz'd and still the wonder grew,
> That one small head could carry all he knew."

It is natural to suppose that all the theories, propounded with the view of explaining the action of the divining rod, must have been crude and unsatisfactory. It is always so, when a new subject is presented to the attention of man.

A superficial glance, instead of a careful examination, inclines him to the reception of the whole as truth. This is the first mistake, one not only constantly made by particular individuals, but by mankind in general. Either the whole of a novelty is swallowed as an absolute verity, or it is rejected as unworthy of notice. We are either intensely credulous or incredulous. The mind deduces conclusions before it has had the proper data furnished it for the purpose. Indeed time is always demanded for ascertaining what are data, and what mere specious forms. The history of every science shows the great trials it has had to undergo, from prejudiced enemies and rash friends, one condemning wholesalely and the other adopting all appearances as truths. This is true with regard to the divining rod. Indeed it would be easier to believe all the powers asserted to belong to the rod, than to adopt the theories that either the clergy or the laity propounded as to the cause of its action. They only show the ignorance of their authors and give us no aid in our attempt to get a true theory on the subject.

First among these theories was that propounded by the clergy, attributing the movements to diabolical agency. The idea, that the powers of heaven could have any thing to do with the rod, was peremptorily disposed of in this way,—heaven could not be interested in the subject, therefore the lower regions must. The only duty of good men in this view of the matter was, to aid in delivering devout persons from this unfortunate gift, which could only be possessed in consequence of some voluntary or involuntary *pacte* with the Devil.

Malebranche at first admitted that it might be possible, that the rod was deflected over metallic veins and springs, but when he learned that, in Dauphiny, it was deflected towards robbers and thieves, he refused to admit the apparent phenomena, "and not being able by the force of reason alone to explain the effects that had been duly attested, he also attributed these to the agency of the devil." He says, "one should have a general horror of any

thing that proceeds from him, upon whom God has pronounced an eternal anathema."

The supposition of diabolical agency prevented that kind of investigation, which would have collected facts of a character to show the true nature of the supposed wonders of the divining rod. Besides the latter, in its legitimate province, as a means of discovering metals and hidden springs, did not show any greater power than the magnetic needle,—did not even possess as much of the marvellous, and yet no one felt like attributing the polar direction of the needle to such agency. The moral revelations of the divining rod were so evidently mere pretensions that it was necessary to claim Satanic influences as their exciting cause. But when the clergy had once promulgated this idea, of course it gained ground and closed up all examination of the subject.

The next theory claiming attention was that of the abbeède Vallemont. This is a most amusing attempt at an explanation of the movements of the rod. "By a species of insensible transpiration there is continually given off from bodies, material particles, which rise in the air following a vertical direction. In their course they come into contact with the divining rod, saturating it and causing it to rise or to fall in order to assume a direction parallel with that of the corpuscles. * * The operator, himself receiving these corpuscular emanations, communicates them, through the pores of his skin, to the rod, which then begins to turn in his hands." In consequence of the difference in the pores of the skin, some men are skillful with the divining rod, and others entirely devoid of skill. In order to make the theory meet all possible cases, it is only necessary to suppose that the corpuscular emanations, given off from subterranean springs, metallic veins and other treasures of nature, differ in character, as well as those which are given off from the bodies of robbers, assassins, and all other perpetrators of crimes. Those from the bodies of murderers are particularly powerful on the nervous sensibility of men, like Aymar, able to use the divining rod for

their detection. They produce the terrible uneasiness which he experienced—the horrible agitation of his body, the painful sensations which manifested themselves throughout his whole system. While ordinary emanations only affected the rod,—these would produce what might be called "the very torrent, tempest and whirlwind" of suffering.

It is difficult to keep one's gravity at this most ludicrous attempt at an explanation. We are bewildered amid the multitude of special emanations, with which we must be surrounded, without our knowledge, at all times. Every substance in nature contributes to this collection. The particles must have the power of passing through each other, unaffected by winds and heat, unperceived by ordinary mortals. The earth is a grand manufactory of annoyances to the nervous system of the sensitive employer of the divining rod; every animal that sports in the air contributes to his uneasiness, and the perpetrators of crimes furnish the most painful of all corpuscular emanations to his sensibility. If all this had been presented to us in the region of fiction, we would consider it somewhat ingenious, but when it challenges our credence on the score of scientific explanation it is simply ridiculous. It is true,

> "There are more things in heaven and earth,
> Than are dreamt of in our philosophy,

but this theory accumulates them in such quantities, that the human mind can not tolerate the conception. We have read somewhere of the man who had learned, from the teachings of the microscope, the wonders of the animalculae that live out their brief existence in the water and the air,—that infest in millions articles of food and drink, who was so appalled by the dangers surrounding him from these sources, that he refused food and drink and died from starvation—in order to escape the liabilities to injury arising from these sources. Only imagine the case of a man, who had suddenly become cognizant of the wonderful potency of these infinitesimally small material emanations on his nervous

system. What tortures his life would abound in,—what a release death would be to such a constant sufferer!

The best plan of examining the pretended power of the explorers is to look more carefully into their mode of procedure. How could the explorers know what was the particular body which attracted the rod so powerfully? How distinguish between the metals and water, and how distinguish one metal from another? Three rules were adopted for this purpose. *First;* the rod only bent when it was held over the particular substance, which the explorer was seeking. Hence his will must be active,—his intention fixed on the certain object. The same rod would answer for all possible investigations, in the hands of a skillful man. When he wished to seek for concealed springs, then it would turn over water and not over metals, and vice versa. If employed with the view of detecting murderers —nothing but the object in view—the perpetrator of the crime could affect it; passing over water, or mines of inexhaustible wealth, would not cause it to deviate from the direct path of its duty. It will be perceived, that a wonderful amount of intelligence, as well as resolution, was attributed to the rod by its partizans. Either the rod or the corpuscles might be considered as very obedient servants to the will of the explorer. A *second* method was by physical experiment. "Whenever the rod began to bend over any place, to know whether water or a metal was concealed, it was only necessary to place a piece of moist paper or linen on the rod. If the movement continued, the concealed article was water. If the contrary, a metal or at least something else than water. To ascertain then what metal it was, different metals would be successively brought near the rod. Its motion would be checked when metals different from that concealed were brought near it; and, on the contrary, the same kind of metal would cause it to turn. The *third* rule prescribes the very opposite of the last: the rod should *not* turn on bringing near it a piece of metal of the same kind as that concealed in the earth, but should turn for all other kinds. These two last pre-

cepts re-establish belief in the sympathies and antipathies of metals and non-metallic substances, an idea of the middle ages which has been for a long time the object of ridicule."

The art of Rhabdomancy thus exhibits its errors and the fallacious reports of its cultivators, as soon as it attempts to explain the results alledged to be obtained by its processes. Neither the theological explanation, nor the corpuscular theory, nor the scientific statement of its rules, present it, in any way, so as to command our respect. Decided and firm opposition to it, however, increased the number of its believers. We are always prone to side with the weaker party. Our interests may be furthered by arraying ourselves under victorious banners, but the lowest passions of our nature are nurtured and strengthened when we find an opportunity to denounce the successful and triumphant. This is seen in the change of sentiment in the people towards the perpetrator of a foul murder. So long as he is at large, all voices unite in condemning the act and declaring that condign punishment must be his reward. When, however, after a fair trial the sentence of law has been pronounced, then our sympathies are arrayed on the side of the criminal, and we pray the executive authority to remember mercy and release him from the penalty. Then we can find excuses of various kinds to explain away the heinousness of the offence, and to justify the commission of the murderous deed. A quack may trifle with the health or morals of the public by erroneous medical or theological teachings, and he will neither receive sympathy or countenance from the public; but only let those, whose life-study has been the proper elucidation of such subjects, attempt to have the proper measure of condemnation or punishment meted out to him, and crowds rally under his banner ready to do battle in his cause. All this looks very much like real, hearfelt sympathy, true philanthropic feeling for those who are persecuted. It is nothing but the rebellion of humanity against law and authority,—the exhibition of the spirit of disregard for law and

authority which tends to make a nation a byword and reproach.

So long as the wise and discreet opposed rhabdomancy with any fierceness, although proofs of the deceptions practiced by Aymar and his followers were collected in formidable array, although religious scruples were aroused by the theory of Satanic agency, although archbishops, bishops and divines without number discountenanced the divining rod, although Cardinal Le Camus denounced those who employed it within his diocese, and the inquisition in 1701 condemned the works written in its defence,—still, despite all these, the very opposition excited "a crowd of distinguished and worthy people, and among them even ecclesiastics of all degrees, who would declare the fact that the divining rod did move and, notwithstanding all statements to the contrary, in the words of Galileo, *E pur si muove.*" "The phenomena presented by Bleton in France and Pennet and others in Italy, could not be contested. To explain these Doctor Thouvenel conceived the theory which attributes all these phenomena to electrical action." Science was called in to aid in explaining that which science had been forced to condemn.

Thouvenelis theory was considered applicable both to the metal-seekers and the hydroscopists or water-seekers. Metallic veins and subterranean streams of water were supposed to eliminate electrical currents, which acted directly on the bodies of the employers of the divining rod, imparting to them peculiar influences which caused the motions of the rod. They penetrated the body, traversed the lungs, and, acting through the nervous system, produced the wonderful impressions, which manifested themselves in the case of Bleton and others of his class. Thouvenel justified his theory by directing attention to the fact, that occasionally wonderful exaltations of the senses were manifested in certain individuals, so that sight or hearing was wonderfully acute, or touch was so delicate that astonishing results were manifested in this way. But notwithstanding this reference, we must judge of scientific theories

by scientific laws, and in this way we shall find that his imposing scientific fortifications and warlike array (*l'echafaudage scientifique*) in defence of rhabdomancy will fall at the first fire from the unerring batteries of science. We could not *argue* with the corpuscular emanations of the abbé de Vallemont. They were too refined and delicate for the cognizance of our reasoning faculties,—too ethereal to be adjudged by laws of matter. But electric currents can be made subjects for argument,—are open to experiment and susceptible of positive demonstration. They always need conducting bodies to form the paths along which they should travel, and it is a fair subject of inquiry—what is the conducting body between the hidden water and the experimenter. But there is nothing, between the experimenter and the metallic treasure or the water, except the soil and the atmosphere. The former is an excellent conductor of electricity, and would speedily distribute it, if given off from the objects in question, throughout its immense mass, while the air, being a bad conductor of electricity unless in a moist condition, could not be employed at all in this particular business. And besides all these considerations, why should concealed streams of water produce such wonderful effects on the nervous system, when large bodies of water, directly exposed to the atmosphere, failed to produce any effect at all. In truth, directly the touchstone of science is applied to the so called scientific explanation of the matter, we find all its glitter disappears and it presents a mass of base tinsel instead of the pure gold promised us.

In 1826 the divining rod made its appearance again in France. No longer known by its old name, which had become unfashionable, but as the forked baton or *furcelle*, claiming notice under the patronage of Count *J. de Tristan*. The employer of the instrument was called *bacillogire* or bacillogyrator, and the term rhabdomancy exchanged for that of *bacillogyration*. *A rose by any other name will smell as sweet.* Tristan's theory is full of Thouvenel's idea of the existence of electrical currents, and yet we find the same objection to both,—no proof of the existence of such cur-

rents is furnished us. The electroscope, by which the most delicate waves of electrical excitement are made manifest, is not employed by Tristan, and we find ourselves, while studying his demonstrations, somewhat in the same condition as though we attempted to study the Arabian Nights by the aid of modern science,—to ascertain, for instance, how, in one moment after Aladdin had given the order, to the slave of the lamp, to bring him something to eat, "the genius returned with a large silver basin, which he carried on his head, and twelve covered dishes of the same material filled with the nicest meats, properly arranged, and six loaves as white as snow upon as many plates; two bottles of the most excellent wine, and two silver cups in his hand."—All discussions of this kind might have pleased the schoolmen of the middle ages, but we must know whether the thing to be examined be real, before we commence an examination of its nature, or attempt to explain the laws of its existence. Until we find a *chimera ruminans in vacuo*, it is a matter of no moment to us to know whether *devoret secundas intentiones*.

Before we give our own opinion on the movements of the divining rod, when found in the hands of the trustful and honest, in order to complete the general survey of the subject, contemplated in this article, it will be necessary to notice the *pendule explorateur*, which attracted some attention in Munich and Paris, and which involves the same principles as the divining rod. The instrument consists of a cube of iron pyrites, or a crystal of sulphur or of one of the metals. This was attached to slightly moistened thread, half an ell in length. When held between the fingers, over water, or any of the metals, "it would insensibly begin to form eliptical oscillations, which would become circular, and more and more regular. The movement around the north pole of the magnet, would be from left to right and from right to left, around the south pole." This subject was investigated carefully by many scientific gentlemen. Complicated theories were offered by way of solving it. It was considered that the movements were pro-

duced by a combination of electricity and organic force, which united force was styled *organ-electric*. The theory was more imposing than Thouvenel's, only because more high-sounding words were employed. It was no more entitled to respect, and science soon stripped it of its bright attractions.

Chevreul proved by experiment that "the movement of the pendulum was not determined by the action of any body placed either below or in the vicinage of the oscillating pendulum. The motion proceeds from the hand, and only from the hand of him who holds the thread of the pendulum. The experimenter exercises this action in a manner involuntary and perfectly without his knowledge. The action results from very small movements or simple *muscular tensions*, determined by the will or thought or any other moral agency. From this arises a slight motion, producing a feeble muscular impulse. A number of the latter added together produce a mechanical effect, which manifests itself in the oscillations of the pendulum."—These conclusions were arrived at by Chevreul in experiments carefully made by himself. He observed that the same motions were produced in his own case as in the case of others. It occurred to him that they might be produced by the mind, intensely anxious as to the experiment, unconsciously acting on the hand. To satisfy himself on this point, his eyes were blindfolded,—the pendulum then remained at rest. In every case, when an experimenter was blindfolded, the movements of the pendulum ceased. Deprived of the sight of the pendulum, the mind could obtain no idea as to its condition, and the same amount of determination to keep the hands at rest was effectual in preventing motion, although it seemed to be of no account when the pendulum was full in sight. We are indebted then to Chevreul for directing attention to the fact that motions may be made by portions of the body, even without the aid of the will, and that other mental faculties may act on the voluntary muscles, bringing them into full play even when the individual is perfectly

unconscious of this action. This principle may be usefully employed in investigating the singular phenomena, connected with the movements of tables and other articles of furniture, which have been, by some, attributed to supernatural powers. We shall find that most of these phenomena, which are not voluntary frauds are involuntarily such from the muscles of both hands and feet being put into action, by other mental faculties than the will. The *involuntary complicity* of thought, thus referred to, can now be applied to the examination of the movements of the divining rod. In order to be as brief as possible we shall use the explanation, or rather application of Chevreul's explanation as furnished by M. Figuier.

"Among the numerous adept practitioners with the divining rod, a small number only are impostors,—the larger number act with sincerity. The divining rod does turn in their hands, independent of all artifice, and the phenomena, be they what they may, are real; this movement of the rod, however, by virtue of an act of thought and without any consciousness, on their part, of this secret action of their will. Natural indications, such as the presence of very rich green grass, the slope of the soil, the moisture of neighboring places, &c., but more frequently still the unwished for desire, the idea that the phenomena will take place, these provoke, all unknown to the experimenter, the rotation of the rod,—that is, they cause very small muscular movements which suffice to produce, by accumulation, a slight mechanical effect, which, disturbing the equilibrium of the rod, causes it to execute the motion that follows these involuntary acts."

With this explanation we can understand how prayer would be all powerful in removing the faculty of using the divining rod in hydroscopy. The very determination, associated with a belief in the efficacy of a higher power to deprive them of what they had learned to consider as of Satanic origin,—these would make the mind so on the alert that all involuntary complicity would be prevented, and the divining rod would cease to move in their hands.

The wish that the movement would take place, the desire to witness the phenomena, the intention, if we may so call it, being absent no movement was produced.

There has alway been a difficulty in examining this subject, in consequence of the want of some mode of explaining the movements of the divining rod when in the hands of those, whom we know to be above all suspicion of dishonesty. This want is now supplied, and we feel that it relieves us of the necessity of keeping quiet on the subject. There are some pretenders, whose very manner will create suspicion, and although we may not be able to detect them in their fraud, yet we feel more than half assured that fraud there is. Such were the astrologers and wonder-workers of the past, who would

* "question Mars, and, by his book,
Detect who 'twas that nimm'd a cloak
Make Mercury confess, and 'peach
Those thieves which he himself did teach.
They'll find i' th' physiognomies
O' th' planets, all men's destinies,
Like him that took the doctor's bill;
And swallow'd it instead o' th' pill;
* * *
They'll feel the pulses of the stars,
To find out agues, coughs, catarrhs,
And tell what crisis does divine
The rot in sheep, or mange in swine;
* * *
What makes man great, what fools or knaves,
But not what wise, for only of those
The stars (they say) cannot dispose.
No more than can the astrologians;
There they say right, and like true Trojans."

The coincidences between the movements of the rod and the presence of water are few in comparison with the cases where movements without the presence of water have taken place. The former are recollected and are quoted as of far more importance than the failures. The successful ticket in a lottery always produces more excitement than the numberless tickets which have proved blanks at the drawing. It constitutes the shallow basis on which men

calculate their probabilities of success. The successful treatment of one case by the quack gives him more reputation than is sufficient to cover up the bad effects of his failures, and makes him a reputation for shrewdness and ability which quiet practitioners of medicine fail to attain. When we prove that a thing is improbable, or a pretended science false, it is not incumbent on us to show why certain results of a different character have been obtained; for, even despite improbabilities, sequences may occur not necessarily consequences of the previous course pursued. Instances illustrating this position are by no means few or rare. Hence while we are not obliged to pronounce a man a charlatan who employs the divining rod in searches after metals or water, it is not necessary for us to explain how it is that the rod has been deflected from its position over places where these have been afterwards found, since the number of such cases is very small and, when examined with scientific care, they may all be included in the category of accidental coincidences. The day has passed when we could admit any thing as a cause which reason will not allow us to connect directly and necessarily with the pretended effect.

Frederick City, Md. L. H. S.

Art. III.—LITURGICAL WORSHIP.*

When we examine the earliest history of the German Reformed Church in this country, we find much, that especially in this age of re-awakened churchly feeling, should arouse us to earnestreflection; and on this account. Special importance attaches to the following facts:

The pioneers of the Church brought with them to this western land a Christian view of the Church, based upon those principles in the word of God which our Church appropriates as peculiarly her own. They felt the necessity of establishing churches and Christian schools wherever they settled. These Churches, although in no connection with the mother Church in Europe, and scarcely known to each other, grew, like scattered seeds, each one for itsef, as it was able, from which was to be developed a united Church of the future. They preserved with great solicitude the faith and Church of their fathers. Their helps to this end, in connection with the Bible, were their hymnbooks and liturgies, which may yet be found, here and there, as venerable relics of an age true to the faith of the Church.

The mother Church in Germany and Switzerland finally turned her eyes towards her youthful daughter in the wilds of distant America, and supported by the venerable Synod of Holland, sent laborers into this new vineyard of the Lord, who sought out these scattered churches and brought them into closer communion with each other.

The Rev. Michael Schlatter from St. Gallen in Switzerland, was particularly successful in uniting the different congregations into a Classical and Synodical union which

* A discourse on Acts 2: 42, prepared and published by Rev. J. S. Kessler, D. D., in the German language, at the request of members of Goshenhoppen Classis, German Reformed Church. Translated by Cyrus V. Mays, A. B.

was never afterwards entirely sundered. Through him also, the union with the mother Church for the first time became regular and beneficial. This blessed connection was afterwards for a long time broken off by the American Revolution. During this isolation a strict orthodox faith was indeed preserved, but side by side with this, there also sprang up a sad ignorance, and the churchly life that once bloomed so beautifully threatened to wilt and die.

During the first twenty years of the present century, New-England Puritanism and Methodism introduced an active life into this state of decay, but a life for which the Church paid dearly; for with it there came also an unhealthy fanatical piety—a piety growing out of artificial religious incentives, rather than out of the pure Word of God and the ordinary means of grace. This piety was only too readily exchanged for the quiet, yet powerful grace of God. The Reformed conception of the Apostolic Church, and the beautiful liturgical services of our fathers were on this account for the greater part lost to us. From this, too, proceeds the nakedness and coldness of public worship in our time. This is the reason why the congregation takes so little part in the worship of the sanctuary, as if it had not met for the purpose of worshipping and praising God, but could hand over this sacred service, this great privilege to the choir, or omit it altogether. Hence, also, it no longer appropriates, as its own, the prayers of the Church of all ages as they are expressed in its liturgy, but leaves the duty altogether to the arbitrary will of each pastor. From this, too, it comes that men understand the service of the sanctuary to consist merely in listening to the sermon, which is, and should be, nothing more than an admonition and encouragement to consecrate our whole lives to the worship of God.

But God did not suffer the Church in this country to sink altogether, neither did He allow our denomination to perish. Especially during the last twenty years has our Church become more and more conscious of her peculiar life, and of her mission in this country. In consequence

we have again turned back and asked for the lost treasures of our Church—her hymn-books and liturgies. Our Synod gave practical encouragement to this tendency by appointing a Committee to prepare a Liturgy, which, after long and extensive labors, has very successfully completed its work.

Our Church having departed so far from the spirit of our fathers, and even here and there, shown a tendency to ignore it altogether, nothing less could be expected than that the appearance of this liturgy should be looked upon as a new thing, and by many as a bold innovation, in view of which, many called, but also uncalled for voices allowed themselves to be heard.

Beloved Brethren! Since we are here assembled for the purpose of deliberating on the advancement of the kingdom of God, and since it is in liturgical worship that the universal Church gives expression to her penitence, her faith, her prayers, and her praises, and through which the individual worshipper feels himself united with the visible and invisible members of the Church of Christ, and with them approaches the throne of God in humility and sorrow to confess his sins; to present to the Lord his prayers and intercessions, his thanks and his praises, and to seek his grace and protection for the future, it will not be deemed improper to speak a word on Christian Cultus—Church worship or the liturgy. We shall, therefore, by the grace of God, consider as our theme—the *liturgy with special reference to the minister as a liturgist.*

I. What are we to understand by the term liturgy?

II. Should a liturgy be used in public worship?

III. What is demanded of the minister as a liturgist?

1. "And they continued," &c. These words lead us to consider the results produced by the preaching of Peter on the day of Pentecost at Jerusalem. They serve to give us an insight into the life of the first Christian Church at Jerusalem founded by the Spirit of God through the instrumentality of the Apostle's preaching. Here we have the beginning, as it were, the germ of the Christian Church,

which, according to Protestant, and especially Reformed views, is a communion of such persons as believe in Christ and feel themselves called and driven to give evidence of their faith according to established rules, in public worship as well as in their lives. Such a Church did the Spirit of God plant in Jerusalem through the preaching of Peter as a seed from which the Christian Church was to grow up, like a tree, whose branches should cover the whole earth.

As the words of the Apostle exhibit to us the beginnings of the Christian Church in her outward form, so do they also show us the first elements of Christian Cultus. By Christian Cultus we understand the form of Christian worship—a form, however, that is not to be left to the arbitrary will of the individual minister, but which is the product of the reigning spirit of the Church, and which, on this account, the single congregation appropriates as coming from herself. A liturgy naturally unfolds itself from this Cultus; for the forms of public worship are not to be mere mute transactions, but must be clothed with words of instruction, of prayer, and of blessing. These words again are not to be left to the arbitrary will of the minister, but the Spirit that reigns in the Church takes them from the Word of God, gives them to the congregation as instructive and edifying forms of devotional exercises, and the congregation makes them her own, since they proceed from the Church. They become standing forms in the Church through which the congregation are called to express their devotion whenever they assemble for worship. Every individual finds in them all that he needs, since in the general parts of the Church are comprehended also those of the individual member, and in the balm that flows for all, each one finds a share. The beginning of a Christian Cultus is found already in the language of the Apostle.

It is said, "*They* remained." The pronoun "*they*" has reference to none others than those whom the Spirit, through the preaching of Peter, had collected from the world and had united into a living brotherhood in Christ. Their life had become changed; they had renounced the

service of the world, the flesh and the devil and had given themselves to Christ their Lord and Master by whose precious blood they had been purchased. Their new life, however, was not yet perfect in godliness; but as with all new converts, was yet in its infancy—in the germ, and needed continual nourishment in order to its growth; so that "they might come unto the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ." The living fountain from which, by faith, they drew sustenance for their young life, was Jesus Christ Himself.

Just as the Spirit of God, through faith in the preached word of our Saviour had united them into a living brotherhood in Christ, so did he also unite them still closer to Christ by outward bonds—bonds which preserved them as a community in continual intercourse with Him. These bonds were the means of grace, the Bible, Charity, the Sacraments and prayer or Cultus.

"They remained in the *doctrine* of the Apostles." Not in the doctrine that every one might proclaim according to his own private judgment; but they remained in the Apostles' doctrine. According to their own enunciation and the teachings of the Apostles, the substance of this doctrine was Jesus Christ, the crucified One. The Apostles proclaimed all that referred to Him in the sayings of the Prophets: they taught the history of His birth and life; His teachings, sufferings, death, resurrection and ascension, and finally they exhorted men to repentance and faith. This was the teaching of the first Church at Jerusalem. Here we find a complete pattern for a Christian sermon with respect to a liturgy. Of this, however, we shall speak hereafter. The sainted Rauch presents this truth very forcibly in his sermon, "Every man is the Lord's in life," where he says, "The life of Christ; his sufferings, death, and resurrection; the nesessity of repentance, regeneration and faith must be the constant theme of the minister."

"They continued in the *fellowship*." As the Spirit of God had united them into a living fellowship in Christ, so he also constrained them to give proof of this fellowship by

an outward form. They all acknowledged themselves members of the one spiritual body of Christ. In the suffering of the individual member, they realized the suffering of the whole body; and in the joy of the one, the joy of all. On this account they supplied the necessities of all, thus causing the members of Christ's body to rejoice. That this brotherly fellowship no longer exists among us, and that the State must minister to the wants of the poor through paid officers, is not to the credit of the Church, but is an evidence that the Christian churchly view and the Cultus of the Apostolic Church is lost to us.

"They continued in the *breaking of bread.*" The Holy Spirit had united them as a family consecrated to God. In the consciousness of this family relation they held daily common meals—love feasts—*agapae*—at the close of which they celebrated the Holy Communion in mutual remembrance of the expiatory sufferings and death of our Saviour. It may be confidently accepted that in this too, the form was not left to the arbitrary judgment of the individual, but rather, that they celebrated it as our Lord himself had instituted it; that they accompanied it with the words he used as they are recorded by the apostles and evangelists. So that here already we have a communion service and a communion liturgy.

Finally: "they continued in *prayer.*" Doubtless every member of this first Christian congregation poured out his heart in prayer to God in his own quiet closet and in the family circle; but with all this they still felt the necessity of social prayer for the strengthening of their common Christian life. That during these prayer-meetings they did not all pray confusedly is certain, since the Holy Spirit is a spirit of order and not of disorder. That some did give utterance to the ardent desires of their hearts in spontaneous prayers, before the assembly, may be admitted; but just as readily must we admit that already early they made use of permanent forms, in connection with their extempore prayers. They had our Lord's Prayer, the benedictions of the apostles, and for the singing of praises they

had the hymns of the angels, of Zacharias, of Mary and of Simeon, to say nothing of what they may have retained from the worship of the Jewish synagogue. It is, therefore, not venturing too far to admit that even here we have the commencement of liturgical prayers.

This explanation of the Apostle's language leads us now more directly to answer the question, "What are we to understand by a liturgy?" Wherever we find the existence of a living and energetic soul in a healthy body, it always makes itself known by its outward actions. This may be applied to the Church and the outward manifestations of her life; consequently to Christian Cultus. The Church is the communion of saints; and its end is to manifest and develop the higher life in Christ according to appointed means. The soul of the Church is the Christian religion, whose nature it is to establish a fellowship through which it reveals itself. According to this, religion operates through the Church as the soul operates through the body. As all general and organized life, as for instance that of the State, has its own common thought and action, so has also the Church, as such, her common thought and action. Her thought is embraced in her system of Christian doctrine, the basis of which, is the Word of God itself. Her action appears in the form of her devotional exercises, and both are expressed by the general term Cultus. Both, however, must be regarded as thought and action in Christ, since both have being and stability only in Him, and appear as his work in believers, wrought especially by his Word and Sacraments. Both exist in immediate connection with Him who is the head of the Church. Both, therefore, seek to unfold, promote and perfect the higher life in Christ in those who take part in worship; and, where this higher life already exists, they seek to exhibit it in the transactions of divine worship.

Christian Cultus may, therefore, be comprehended under two principal relations. In the first place it tends to awaken and perfect the Christian life which consists in faith that works by love. It designs to produce life where

it does not yet exist, and where it already exists to unfold and perfect it. In this relation Cultus is above all a school in the Church. As such we find it already among the apostles. They stood forth as teachers from the very beginning—for faith cometh by hearing, but hearing by preaching, and preaching by the Word of God. In the second place, where this higher life in Christ has come to consciousness and certainty in those who take part in the public worship of God, Cultus designs to give outward representation to this life and the feelings upon which it rests. In the first relation the minister only is engaged; in the second, however, the whole congregation acts with him. Both relations of this activity of the Church are exhibited in the liturgy; since on the one hand it is designed to be the form of all transactions belonging to the worship of God; and on the other accompanies these spiritual transactions with an instructive, devotional and edifying communication of the truth; so that the minister who reads the liturgy teaches, prays and blesses, not in his own name, but in the name of the Church of our Lord Jesus Christ, and consequently in the name and according to the command of Christ himself. The life of the Christian Church is thus inwardly confirmed by a common knowledge, and outwardly represented by a common transaction. True knowledge is produced and preserved in its purity by the Word of God; and is proclaimed by means of the preaching of the Gospel. The last culminates in the sacraments. It must not be forgotten that equal dignity belongs to both, since they complete each other reciprocally and assist each the other in their activity. For this reason they must never be separated. The Roman Catholic Church, therefore, does injustice to the idea of worship, since in her Cultus she has almost entirely lost sight of the element of doctrine—the sermon, and permits the representative part of worship alone to prevail. In the Cultus of the Protestant Church the sermon has again assumed its place; and this is right, since intelligence is the sure and permanent foundation of our Christian faith and life.

But there is danger here of falling into the opposite extreme—namely, of allowing the sermon to crowd out the representative part of worship, which, as has been remarked, has already taken place in our country to a very great extent. The drowsiness and want of interest on the part of the congregation in the services of the sanctuary, when the sermon and all the transactions are left to the judgment of the minister, can be removed only by the introduction of a Christian protestant liturgy.

We have already partly explained the word liturgy in treating the general term Cultus. We shall, therefore, add only the following:

The word liturgy is derived from the verb *λειτουργειν* to transact openly, and from the substantive *λειτουργια* public transaction. In its most general sense the word denotes all public transactions. It is used in its more limited sense to denote the ministrations belonging to the house of God. Luke, 1: 2–5. It denotes exclusively the form of public worship. It includes the sermon, administration of the sacraments, singing and prayer, confirmation, marriage and funeral ceremonies, and all the transactions belonging to the public worship of God. A liturgy accordingly directs the minister how to proceed when during public worship he acts in the name of the congregation; or it is a directory for the proper discharge of the duties of the minister in ordering and carrying out the exercises of the sanctuary.

The history of Christian worship teaches us how a liturgy gradually proceeded from the bosom of the Church, and how it was accepted by her as a law for the transaction of her public worship. It shows us also how the Reformers purged it from all the additions that had been made by the church of Rome, and how the liturgies now used in the Protestant Church have gradually been developed. Liturgies, although by the operation of the Holy Spirit the product of the Church, are nevertheless not made equal to the word of God, nor considered beyond improvement.—Still the amendment or improvement of a liturgy must

not be undertaken by a single congregation, much less by a single individual—but is the work of the whole Church. In case of the necessity of any change, Synod appoints a committee of its most trust-worthy ministers who prepare and publish a liturgy, which, having been subjected to a general trial, is referred to the whole Synod for approval or rejection. If accepted, such a liturgy becomes the regular form for public worship.

Ought a liturgy to be used in public worship? On this question Dr. Palmer (Herzog's Real-Encyclopedia) speaks as follows: "This question is denied by certain religious parties, who, in their spiritual arrogance, boast of being so full of the Holy Ghost, that they would seem at all times to be provided with the anointed word. Some go so far in their hatred to every ecclesiastical form of worship that they will not repeat even the Lord's Prayer. Among all churches, the Church of Scotland alone, after using the Calvinistic forms of prayer which John Knox had brought with him, has within the last two centuries separated herself from these, as well as from all liturgical service. An account of travels in Scotland published in the Evangelical Church Paper in 1854 shows clearly in what all this has resulted. It necessarily follows that in proportion as the congregation is torn away from the general life of the Church, it is given over to the subjective impulses of the minister. The liturgy as the form of utterance which partly moulds and partly accompanies each ministerial act, must have truly objective force; that is, it must be given to the congregation by the Church through the coöperation of the Holy Ghost, and as such a gift it must be used devoutly. The congregation can accompany the minister in prayer only by the aid of an unchanging, ever recurring formula, whose force is inherent, whose form is not impressed with the peculiarities of any age, and which, by continual repetition embodies the devotional idea in spirit and in truth."

It is universally known that God through Moses prescribed the order of worship to the Jewish nation as well as

the liturgical form. The following may suffice to prove this. In Numb. 6: 22–26, we find that God directed the form of the blessing by which the people were dismissed from the temple. So in Deut. 31: 19. God commanded Moses to compose a song to be put into the mouth of the people that it might become their common language. The 15th, 20th and 122nd Psalms were intended for the congregation and the 113th and 118th Psalms had a liturgical position in the Jewish service. From this we learn that the worship of God in the Church of his people in the old covenant, which is the type of the Church of the new covenant, was already liturgical.

In Luke 4: 16, and in other passages of the New Testament, we find that Christ took part in the worship of the Jewish synagogue as well as in the Temple. He censured the Jews for many things, and the Pharisees especially on account of their long egotistical prayers which were made at the corners of the streets and in the synagogues for the purpose of receiving praise of men. These prayers doubtless, were extemporaneous; but he never censured them for any liturgical form that they may have used. When the disciples of our Lord asked him to teach them to pray as John also taught his disciples, he did not say: "In my Church there must be no formula," but gave them that most perfect of all prayers, the prayer that will continue to be used to the end of all time: "Our Father who are in Heaven."

The opponents of liturgical worship sometimes object to it, because of the opinion that liturgical prayers cannot come from the heart. No one will doubt that the prayers of Christ came from the heart; and above all those which he uttered in his last and most dreadful sufferings. Yet the words "My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?" are taken from the 22nd Psalm; and the last words that fell from his dying lips, "Father into thy hands I commit my spirit" are found in the 31st Psalm. Thus the Redeemer of the world died with a form of prayer upon his lips.

Since the apostles, like their divine master, were accustomed to the liturgical service of the Jews, we may confidently affirm that in the congregations which they planted liturgical service was the peculiar form of worship; and this our text clearly intimates. One circumstance must here be mentioned as a fact that goes far to confirm what has been said. In the ancient Church of the East there is a liturgy which is ascribed to the apostle James, and is regarded as the liturgy of the congregation at Jerusalem. Learned and devout historians say that the original text of this liturgy, though much enlarged to meet the necessities of the times, still, as to contents, form and expression, is a model liturgy. It is, therefore, an old and venerable witness of liturgical service.

That in the course of time liturgical service was very much disfigured by the Roman Church, is well known; but it is equally well known that the Reformers purged it from the additions that had been made, and as far as possible restored it to its original character. Liturgical worship, therefore, is old, and in view of its origin and history it is worthy of honor. Worship without a liturgy, the use of extemporaneous prayers only, is a human innovation, wanting in historical authority; an innovation that contradicts our nature and experience; because on the one hand we cannot conceive of any worship without form, and on the other, our experience teaches us that the sects, who in their false spiritualism have renounced the forms of the Church in their worship and life, cling with the most obstinate tenacity to their self-made forms. A single glance into their history will prove this.

A question, however, here forces itself upon us. Has the liturgy, where it exists, entirely set aside extemporaneous prayer in public worship? By no means. Such prayer finds an appropriate place after the text has been read, or after the exordium when the theme of the minister has been announced, and liturgical ministers generally take occasion to offer a free prayer at this point.

If, therefore, the congregation is liturgical the minister also is bound to be liturgical—a liturgist. The liturgy

gives him directions as to the proper mode of procedure in worship. In this connection we can only indicate what is demanded of him in particular liturgical transactions; and in the first place in that part of Christian worship in which he and the congregation are active at the same time, as for example, when conducting the service on Sunday or on festival days, or administering the sacraments; and in all the services of the sanctuary that are embraced in the general idea of consecration and blessing. In the next place we will state briefly what may be expected of him in the second part of worship which is to serve the Church as a school for the purpose of awakening and promoting Christian life. This has reference to the sermon in which the minister alone is active.

With reference to the first part, the minister must confine himself conscientiously to the whole prescribed form of worship, even as he must to the prayers and blessings. By this it is not meant to say, however, that he is to make no account of the particular occasions and peculiar necessities of the congregation—he shall do this, only not in such a way as to set aside the liturgy. If at any time an alteration of a part or the whole of the liturgy should be considered necessary, he must apply to the Synrd, and never, on any account, arbitrarily change the sacred order of the Church.

In the performance of public service, the reading of prayer and the pronouncing of the blessing, he must preserve himself free from all that is artificial in posture, mien and expression; shun all art with a view of exciting an interest by his own powers; he must perform his duties with an artless, reverential earnestness, conscious that before God and the congregation he is conducting not a service of his own, but an established service that is holy. And the spirit of earnestness and devotion will of itself pass over upon the congregation and both it and he will be edified.

With reference to the second part involving the sermon, in which the minister alone is active, he must guard him-

self with equal care against all that is arbitrary and put himself entirely under the regulation of the liturgy. To this we refer more particularly, since the direction for preaching belongs to Homiletics. We are considering the sermon only in its liturgical aspects.

The words of St. Paul in his letter to the Romans—"Faith cometh by hearing" are by no means to be understood as having reference only to the origin of Christianity or to the spreading of it in the form of missionary labor; but they teach rather the all sufficient and fundamental law of the Church by which she fashions and develops her inner life. The Protestant Church has, therefore, again restored the sermon to its proper place in divine worship.

Since the sermon, as a source of religious instruction, in the worship of the Church, must above all work to the end that faith in the Saviour and in the coming of the kingdom of God, may increase and finally triumph, and that this faith may become the living principle in man of all his acting, the minister must proclaim the divine counsel of redemption in Christ, as this has been developed historically from the time when it was first proclaimed abroad until all shall be fulfilled. Sermons must not appear as a series of short disconnected expositions according to the inclination of the minister, but must rather in themselves tend to produce a system of worship. This thought lies at the bottom of the order of the Church year, the historical groundwork of which represents the life of Christ and the establishing of his kingdom upon earth. The festival days must be prominent as bright and radient points in the Church year, the annual celebration of which brings the life of our Saviour constantly before our eyes. The preparatory and intermediate periods should be filled out by presenting such general truths as are proper objects of Christian knowledge. With reference to liturgical worship, the subject of the sermon is regulated by the three chief festival periods of the Church—Christmas—Easter and Whitsuntide.

The first period begins with the festival of Advent, in which the celebration of our Saviour's birth is the principal point, and closes with the Epiphany. The subjects for the preparatory sermons embrace the prophetical announcements of Christ's coming into the world; the subjects for those of the day of the festivals relate to the history of his birth; while the appearance of the wise men from the east and other passages appointed by the Church close the Epiphany.

The festival of Easter celebrates the sufferings, death and resurrection of Christ. This festival commences with Lent and ends with Whitsuntide—so called from the white dress which was worn for the last time on this day by those catecumens who were baptized on Easter. The principal days of this festival are Good Friday and Easter. The subject matter for the sermons on this occasion, represents the sufferings, death and resurrection of Christ. Low Sunday has reference to the lesson contained in the 1st Epistle of John 5: 4–10 and in the lesson of the Gospel, as recorded by St. John 20: 19–31. It was regarded by the ancient Church as preparatory to the feast of the Ascension of Christ and the descent of the Holy Ghost.

Whitsuntide.—These are the days of the outpouring of the Holy Ghost and the establishment of the Church. The first two festivals embrace the whole life of Christ on earth from the moment of his birth to the time when he showed himself to his disciples as their risen Saviour. The third festival represents Him as ascended to heaven and sitting at the right hand of God, where he fulfills his promise to send the Comforter, and where he governs the Church as her invisible and divine head. This feast begins with Ascension day and closes with Holy Trinity. The middle point is represented more particularly by the day of Pentecost, the subjects for which are the outpouring of the Holy Spirit, the establishment, preservation and government of the Christian Church. This festival has a solemn close in the celebration of the Holy Trinity. The subjects for sermons for this time embrace the account of

the ascension of Christ; the outpouring of the Holy Ghost and the doctrine of the Holy Trinity. The time intervening between these festivities as noticed above, is taken up by presenting such truths as refer either to the past feast, or point to the one coming. The time between the feast of Trinity and the beginning of the Church year gives a fitting occasion for such general subjects as the Gospel lessons may indicate, or as the minister himself may draw from the unfathomable depths of inspiration.

If, in addition to this, the minister sustains a relation of complete living communion to his congregation, so that in his care for individual souls the general and prominent wants of the congregation become known to him; and if he seeks in his discourses to meet these wants, then will every member find his own words fully met in such discourses. Such sermons will make an impression upon his thoughts and feelings. They will expand his imperfect and limited veiws of religion and enliven all his better feelings; and thus through the reciprocal action of the pastor and congregation the religious life of the individual and of the whole congregation is continually rendered more and more perfect. This, in connection with what has been already said, expresses what we mean when we speak of the sermon in its liturgical aspect.

In this manner the preaching of the Word and the other parts of Christian Cultus, year by year, present to the eyes of each believer Jesus Christ as he is known to us in his blessed life and works; in his expiatory sufferings and death; in his glorious resurrection and ascension; in the outpouring of the Holy Ghost, and in the founding and preservation of his Church. The promise of Christ, "Lo! I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world," bears to him a joyful certainty. He sees and feels Christ present and active in the Church to teach, to save, to protect and to sanctify. This binds him continually closer and closer to his Saviour, from whom he receives life and light, peace and salvation.

We close our discussion with the words recorded by Dr.

Olshausen in the exposition of our text, when he says: "Although the gospel teaches that God is to be worshipped in spirit, it yet requires an outward form of worship. The Redeemer designed to found a visible Church, which necessarily presupposes an external service of God—or Cultus. Worship, accordingly, exists in the Christian Church not only for the sake of the weak, but also for those most advanced, in whom the old natural man, that must have an outward form, still lives. Worship, too, is instituted not merely for the proclamation of the gospel to unbelievers, but it also embraces an element of pure adoration for the faithful. The worship of the Church is designed for a perpetual thank-offering of believers, which is presented to the Lord for his ever-during, valid sacrifice of propitiation, as it is said in 1 Peter 2: 5—To offer up spiritual sacrifices, acceptable to God by Jesus Christ."

Only such a service of God can exert a holy and saving influence upon our lives, so that we pass through our earthly pilgrimage as living members of Christ's body until at last all imperfection ceases, and that which is perfect appears; when it will be said, "Behold the tabernacle of God is with men, and he will dwell with them and they shall be his people, and God himself shall be with them and be their God. And God shall wipe away all tears from their eyes; and there shall be no more death, neither sorrow, nor crying, neither shall there be any more pain: for the former things are passed away. Behold! I make all things new. Amen."

Art. IV.—NOTES ON THE AGAMEMNON OF AESCHYLUS.

[Continued.]

V. 181. *δαιμόνων δέ που χάρις, κ. τ. λ.* has reference to the *σωφρονεῖν* of the preceding verse: "of Gods the grace (gift) this is forsooth" (*που*).—The verb *ἥμαι* is usually put with *ἐπί* and the genitive, more rarely, as here, with the accusative. So we find below v. 673 *σωτὴρ ναῶν θέλους' ἐφέζετο*; and Prometh. v. 889 *θακοῦντα πανκρατεῖς ἕδρας*.—The Scholiast makes *σέλμα*=*τὸν ζυγόν*, and adds *ὀφίζυγος γὰρ ὁ Ζεύς*. Aeschylus makes frequent use of this metaphor, by which the ruler of gods and men is represented as seated at the helm. In a similar manner the Romans applied the expressions *in puppi sedere* and *clavum tenere* to the chief magistrates of the commonwealth. The gods generally are here represented as "all-powerfully seated at (*βραίως . . ἡμένων*) the lofty helm," but commonly the figure is only applied to Jove.

V. 184. *ἡγεμὼν ὁ πρέσβυς, κ. τ. λ.* This sentence extends to v. 205, where *εἶπε* is the predicate of the main proposition, and where on account of the great length of the subordinate clauses, the poet finds it necessary to repeat the subject by his *ἄναξ δ' ὁ πρέσβυς*. The *τότε* of v. 184 corresponds to its correlative *ἐπεὶ* of v. 198. The *ἡγεμὼν ναῶν* here alluded to is Agamemnon. The Scholiast refers *ὁ πρέσβυς* to the age of the King: *μείζων γὰρ Μενελάου*, and Schütz renders likewise *natu major*, but this adjective is often used in such connections without the auxiliary conception of age, in the sense of "venerable."

V. 185. Blomfield wishes to read *οὔτανα φέγγει* or *οὔτ' ἐφεγγεν*; quite unnecessarily, as this would spoil the symmetry of the period. Stanley and Humboldt connect *οὔτανα* with *μάντιν*, *vatem neminem vituperans*, scheltend keines Sehers

Spruch. As Calchas, however, is the only prophet, whom the King could blame, *οὔτινα* may better be taken in the sense of *οὔ τι* or *οὔ τιν'*, *nullam ob causam, nequaquam.* Why Schneider should wish to supply *φόγον* after *οὔτινα*, so as to have a double accusative with *φέγων*, it is difficult to perceive. The clause may be regarded as expressing a *concession* or *limitation*, which is denoted by the *καί* of v. 184 used in the sense of *καίπερ*: "although casting no blame whatever on the seer," without attaching any blame to him. Cf. Rost Gr. Gramm. § 130.

V. 186—187. *συμπνέων=συμφωνῶν, καὶ οὐκ ἀνθιστάμενος*, (Scholiast) *conspirans, se accommodans, non repugnans.* Humboldt elegantly: Zufalls Fügung tragend still gefasst, submitting with calm composure to these sudden blows of destiny.—*ἐμπαίος=ἐμπεσούσας* (Schol.), a strong epithet used with reference to the suddeness and violence with which the blow of misfortune came upon him: *incidentibus casibus cedens.*—*κεναγγεῖ, vasa exhauriente*, store-consuming. —*βαρύνοντ'* for *ἐβαρύνοντο*, in the plural on account of the collective sense of *λεώς*.

V. 190—191. The Scholiast makes *ἔχων=ἐχόμενος*,—excellent, but unnecessary, for *ἔχειν* is here, as frequently elsewhere, used absolutely in the sense of *situm esse, aliquo loco degere, commorari.* It is therefore not necessary to supply, with Schneider, *αὐτὴν*, i. e. *τὴν ἅλοσαν.*—*παλιρρόθοις, fluctu refluo madentibus, retro strepente fluctu madentibus*, said of the surge rolling to and from the shore, here of the place, where it happens, "flood-abounding, tempestuous, tide-lashed." Cf. Odyss. V. 430.

V. 192. The conjunction *δέ* is here equivalent to *γάρ for.* According to Kühner's Ausf. Gramm. § 736, 2 (Vol. 2), "*δέ* is frequently employed to denote the *ground* or *reason*, and then stands for *γάρ*, with this difference, however, that *γάρ* would represent the clause as logically dependent, whilst *δέ* makes it logically coördinate and of equal importance with that which it serves to explain."

The winds blowing from the Strymon were from the North and consequently adverse to those sailing from Troy.

These the poet now proceeds to designate with a profusion of forcible epithets, in order to exhibit their disastrous effect upon the army and perhaps to palliate the weakness of Agamemnon in yielding to its demand for the unnatural remedy. By bringing ungrateful leisure, fastings, unsafe anchorage, and uneasy apprehensions over men, and sparing neither ship nor cable, making time doubly heavy by reason of the detention, they caused the flower of the Argives to wither and decay. Wellauer, Bothe and others connect δύσορμοι with ἄλαι, and render: *importuosi hominum errores.* I prefer to separate them and to take ἄλαι in its figurative sense of "*mental wanderings,*" i. e., "*anxiety, apprehension, distress.*" The adjectives, *χαλεπόσχολοι, νήστιδες, κ. τ. λ.*, being susceptible of both an active and a passive signification, enhance the power of the delineation. The metaphor ἄνθος Ἀργείων, of which Aeschylus makes frequent use, e. g. Pers. 248 τὸ Περσῶν ἄνθος; Prom. 418 Ἀραβίας ἄρειον ἄνθος, &c., &c., is here as appropriate as it is beautiful: "Proprie enim venti floribus, quos discutiunt, nocent." Schütz.

V. 198. The δέ of this passage is opposed to the *although* implied in the clause μάντιν οὔτινα φέγων of v. 185, and is rendered by "yet, still." ἄλλο implies that the proposed remedy of the bitter distress occasioned by the storm would only be another evil, more aggravating even than the former. It may be translated by "besides, in addition to the bitter storm." Hesychius defines βριθύ by ἰσχυρόν, μέγα, βαρύ, and the Scholiast makes βριθύτερον=ἐπαχθέστερον, *more onerous* or *oppressive.*—προφέρων, "bringing forward, producing," Artemis, i. e., "appealing to her," either as the cause of this demand and for the purpose of shielding himself against odium, or with a view of threatening the leaders with her displeasure in case of disobedience.—βάκτροις *baculis*, h. e., scipionibus, sceptris: "Nam sceptra tum bacula erant, clavis aureis distincta." Blomfield. The striking the ground with the sceptre was an expression either of excessive grief or of anger. Thus it is said of Telemachus, Odyss. II. 8 ποτὶ δὲ σκῆπτρον βάλε γαίῃ, δάκρυ' ἀναρρήσας. Cf. also Iliad. I, 245.

V. 205. Here follows at last the apodosis of the long sentence, of which all the clauses from v. 179 are parenthetical. The *δέ* serves to resume the thread of the discourse: "Then, *I say*, the venerable king thus speaking, said."

V. 206. *κήρ* is made=*τιμωρία* by the Scholiast, with reference perhaps to the "punishment or revenge" that would inevitably follow his disobedience, both from the army and from the incensed divinity. But this is not necessary. *κήρ* in its general sense of "*lot, fate, misfortune,*" covers the entire ground.

V. 207. *ἄγαλμα· πᾶν, ἐφ' ᾧ τις ἀγάλλεται.* Hesychius. "The ornament, jewel of my house." So Choëph. v. 198 *ἄγαλμα τύμβου τοῦδε καὶ τιμὴν πατρός.*

V. 208. *παρθενοσφάγοισι ῥεέθροις*, elegantly and forcibly for *παρθένου σφαγείσης ῥεέθροις*, *virginis occisae sanguine*, "with maiden-slaughter streams."

V. 212. *λιπόναυς*, *desertor classis.* Such a one, being subject to the *λιποναυτίου δίκη*, was visited with disgrace by the laws of the Athenians, precisely like a deserter in the army. *Λιποναυτίου μὲν ἐκρίνετο ὁ τὴν ναῦν ἐλλείπων, ὥσπερ ὁ τὴν τάξιν λιποταξίου.* Pollux 8, c. 6. Respecting those even, who deserted a vessel of any kind in time of danger from a storm, &c., there was a law condemning such delinquents to the loss of the vessel and cargo both: *δίδωσιν ὁ νόμος τὴν ναῦν τῷ ἐναπομείναντι.* Marcellinus in Hermogenem quoted by Spanheim.—*συμμαχίας ἁμαρτών*, not *socios amittens*, as Bothe has it, but *a sociis deficiens.* The verb *ἁμαρτάνω*, in its figurative sense of "trespassing or sinning against" (which I take to be its meaning here), is usually followed by *εἰς* or *περί* with the accusative, more rarely by the dative or the genitive. The passage then would be: "How can I become deserter of the fleet and sin against (turn traitor to) the cause of my confederates?" Schneider, however, justly observes, that *συμμαχίας* may also stand in the sense of "aid," "assistance," and in that case we would render: "failing to contribute my share of aid to my companions in arms?"

V. 215–216. The subject of this sentence is *ἐπιθυμεῖν*, its predicate *θέμις*, the copula being understood. "Ironice dictum, quo Diana tangitur." Bothe. But why *ironice?* or why any allusion whatever to Diana? The phrase *θέμις ἐστί* frequently occurs in Homer, and always in the sense of: "it is just, proper, allowed, sanctioned by existing institutions or by long-established custom," without any reference whatever to divine right or to right as such. Agamemnon wishes to say, therefore, that his associates in arms have a just claim, a right founded on established law and military custom to demand this sacrifice.

The *ὀργᾷ περιόργως* has given rise to much unnecessary controversy and confusion. Two of the earlier editions have *ὀργᾷ*, another *αὐδᾷ*, a word which the Scholiast likewise employs in his explanations. *ὀργᾷ· τῷ τρόπῳ γὰρ αὐδᾷ ὁ μάντις.* The Scholiast evidently regards *ὀργᾷ* as a verb from *ὀργάω*, of which he also seems to make *μάντις* the subject, instead of the more common *Ἄρτεμις*. Now if *ὀργᾷ* (sc. *Ἄρτεμις*) be taken as a verb, it will be necessary to put a comma after it, to connect *περιόργως ἐπιθυμεῖν θέμις* as an explanatory clause: "The wind-appeasing sacrifice, the virgin blood, namely, she angrily demands (aims at), and to cherish such violent desire is her prerogative." Pearson, Casaubon, Stanley and Ruhnken read *ἐπιθυμεῖ Ἄρτεμις*, and the rest as in our text. But Schütz, objecting to such violence to *θέμις*, and alleging, that, if the passage is corrupt at all, such corruption must lurk in the word *ὀργᾷ περιόργως*, changes the word *ὀργᾷ* without any authority, and gives us the alternative of reading either *ἀρχὰς περιόργως ἐπιθυμεῖν θέμις*, or else *παρθενίου θ' αἵματος ὀργᾶν, περιόργως τ' ἐπιθυμεῖν* (sc. *τοὺς ξυμμάχους*) *θέμις*. Now there is no doubt that *ἀρχὰς*, i. e. *τοὺς ξυμμάχους* is the subject accusative to *ἐπιθυμεῖν*, this giving us the most natural interpretation of the passage. But this subject accusative is to be *supplied* from the preceding sentence, or else the poet himself has left it indefinite and at the option of the reader to supply either this one or some other. There is, therefore, no ground for changing *ὀργᾷ*, nor

is there any corruption or difficulty in the expression *ὀργᾷ περιόργως*. Such emphatic repetitions of words of like or kindred signification are of frequent occurrence not only in Homer, but also in all the subsequent Greek authors, and especially in Aeschylus. Thus the Greeks say *μέγας μεγαλωστί* (Homer); *ἐν τῇ ἀληθείᾳ ἀληθῶς* (Plato); *φύσει πεφυκώς* (Xenophon); *πλήθει πολλοί* (Herodotus); and our own poet has *παρῶς ὑπέρπαρον*, Prom. v. 943; *οἶκτον οἰκτρόν ἀΐων*. Hiketid. v. 58; and *δύο λήμασι δισσούς*, Agamemnon. v. 121. On the nature and import of these apparent plenasms cf. Kühner's Ausf. Gr. Gramm. § 858. Bothe has raised another difficulty in regard to the accent of *περιόργως*, which, if derived from *περιοργής*, should have a circumflected ultima *περιοργῶς*, and suggests *περιέργως* from *περιέργου*, *immodicum, pravum*. This would not alter the sense materially. The passage then would read: "For to demand with angry eagerness (importunity) the wind-allaying sacrifice, which is the maiden's blood, is the army's right (just privilege)."

V. 216. *εὖ γὰρ εἴη· καλῶς ἀποβαίη*, Schol. "Vox bene ominantis, cum fati necessitate se coactum videt facere id, a quo abhorret." Bothe. Not an *excusandi formula*, by which the king desires to exculpate his associates, but an expression of resignation to his lot and of the wish, that after all it might end for the best, i. e., be attended with no pernicious consequences to himself. The expression is elliptical, and *γάρ* may be rendered by "well then" (Kühner's Gr. Gramm. § 754, Anm. 2, b.): "Well then (since I cannot avert it) may its issue be propitious, may it end for the best!" Haupt, who refers this prayerful wish to the chorus and not to Agamemnon, explains the ellipsis by rendering: (At deos nolo accusare), *nam* (ut verecunde loquar) *bene eveniat*.

V. 217–219. *ἀνάγκης ἔδυ λέπαδνον, κ. τ. λ.* The Scholiast interprets *ἠναγκάσθη ποιεῖν τροπαίαν μεταβολήν*. The term *λέπαδνον* properly denotes the thong, by which horses were fastened to the yoke or pole of the carriage, here = *ζυγόν*. The simile is one of frequent occurrence in the Greek

drama. "But when he had put on the thong," i. e., submitted to the yoke of necessity,—*πνέων*, "im Geiste athmend" (Humboldt), is said with reference to the gradual and silent origin of the change, to which as yet no utterance had been given.—*τροπαία*, sc. *πνοή*, is properly the wind that has inverted its direction, the return breeze from sea to land; here figuratively and generally "change, turn." So Choëphor. v. 773. *εἰ τροπαίαν Ζεὺς κακῶν θήσει ποτέ*. The accumulation of epithets *δυσσεβῆ, ἄναγνον, ἀνίερον*, and their relative position, one *before* and two *after* the qualified substantive, together with the asyndeton, render the expression peculiarly forcible and vivid: "irreverent change of mind, unchaste, unholy." In the same manner we have above v. 147. *θυσίαν ἑτέραν, ἄνομον, ἄδαιτον*.

V. 220–221. *τόθεν . . . . μετέγνω*. Here begins properly the apodosis of the sentence, which has given rise to various interpretations. Blomfield improperly makes *παντότολμον* the subject and renders: *Exinde audacia sapientiam exuit*. Schneider connects *τό* and *φρονεῖν*, and makes *παντότολμον* adverbially dependent on the verb, like *κακὸν φρονεῖν*, etc. *Seitdem beurtheilte er anders das allkühn Gesinntseyn*, since then he judged differently of the being of all-daring mind, i. e., of desperate audacity. Now *μεταγιγνώσκω* implies a change of mind or purpose, founded on some knowledge or experience subsequent to that on which the original purpose was formed. Hence Hermann and Haupt correctly *mutato consilio decernere; φρονεῖν* here as frequently in the sense of *aiming at, planning, designing*, and *τὸ παντότολμον* object. This seems to be the most obvious and natural construction, and I am inclined to render with Hermann: *Exinde mutato consilio decrevit audacissimum facinus suscipere*. We must not suppose, however, that this interpretation completely removes every scruple in regard to the true import of this obscure sentence. Wellauer justly observes, that the words *φρενὸς πνέων τροπαίαν* and *τόθεν—μετέγνω* (when taken in Hermann's sense) involve a tautology. Moreover, the word *βροτούς*, which is now made

to depend on *θρασύνει*, is merely an emendation of Schütz, Hermann and Blomfield, in lieu of the more ancient *βροτοῖς*, which is found in all the earlier editions and manuscripts, and which it was customary to connect with the preceding verse, not with the parenthetical clause introduced by *γάρ*. Lastly, it has been a matter of dispute, whether the apodosis begins with *τόθεν* (a particle, seldom if ever used to denote the relation of *time*, but rather that of *casuality*: "whence, on which account, from which source"), or with *ἔτλα δ' οὖν* of verse 216. Voss, whose opinion on this subject is not to be despised, seems to have given to all these objections a positive value by making them the basis of his version, which I here submit in English to the option of the student: "But when he took upon himself the yoke imposed by dire necessity, breathing still rebellion in his mind (*τροπαίαν* in the sense of opposite gale), nefarious, corrupt, unholy, by which (i. e., under the influence of which necessity) men fall, as late he saw (*μετέγνω* in the sense of sero intelligere) into the most audacious crimes, for, &c. &c., then he dared (*ἔτλα δ' οὖν*), &c. &c."

V. 222–223. If the active sense of *θρασύνει* can be established, then the emendation of *βροτούς* for *βροτοῖς* becomes desirable; if not, then *βροτοῖς* here, as often the dative among the Tragedians,=*inter homines, humano in genere*.—*αἰσχρόμητις· αἰσχρὰ ποιεῖν ἀναγκάζουσα* (Scholiast), "prompting to base, disgraceful deeds."—*παρακοπὰ· τοῦ νοῦ παρακοπή* (Schol.), "frenzy, perversity, madness," which is called *τάλαινα* on account of the unhappy consequences that follow crime.—*προτοπήμων*, either "greater than all other miseries," as the Scholiast would have it, or else "the first cause of woe, primeval source of misery." The passage, therefore, would read in English: "for base-advising, sad perversity of mind, primeval source of misery, makes men (*βροτούς*) audacious, or grows bold in mortals (*βροτοῖς*)."

V. 224. *ἔτλα δ' οὖν*, "and consequently, sure enough, he dared," &c.—The accusatives *δρωγὰν* and *προτέλεια* here occupy the place of an appositional complement to the predicate of the foregoing sentence. When used in this manner,

the accusative denotes the consequence, destination, or purpose of the action expressed by the preceding predicate, or in other words the purpose or object aimed at. We may supply *ὥστε εἶναι*.. The use of this exegetical accusative is especially frequent among the Tragedians, as well as in Homer, who, however, sometimes actually supplies *ὡς ἔμμεναι* or *ἔμμεναι* simply. So Iliad. IV, 141. *παρήϊον ἔμμεναι ἵππων*; and Iliad. III, 50. *πατρί τε σῷ μέγα πῆμα . . . . . δυσμενίσιν χάρμα.* Cf. Kühner's Ausf. Gramm. § 500, Anm. 2, 3.—*γυναικοποίνων πολέμων*, i. e., *belli ad poenas ob mulierem raptam persequendas suscepti.*—*προτέλεια ναῶν*, "*sacrificia pro fausto navium egressu oblata*, pluralis pro singulari." Schütz. The *προτέλειος θυσία* or *προτέλεια* sc. *ἱερά* was any preliminary or initiatory sacrifice (from *πρὸ* & *τέλος*), generally offered before the commencement of some solemn act or ceremony, such as marriage, &c., for the purpose of conciliating the favor of some divinity for prosperous success. Hence more generally "any conciliatory or propitiating sacrifice" (Cf. Photius, sub voce): "To be to spouse-avenging strifes an aid, the armament's atoning sacrifice."

V. 228–230. The word *κληδών* is here equivalent to *κλῆσις*, the act of calling, naming; hence *κληδόναξ πατρώους*, *voces patrem invocantes*, the cries addressed to her father, the invocations of her father.—*αἰῶνα παρθένειόν τ'* may either mean: "and her tender age," or "else, the life of the virgin, the maiden's life."—*παρ' οὐδὲν . . . . ἔθεντο*, "made of no account, heeded not."—*βραβῆς*, the Attic nom. pl. of *βραβεύς* "umpire, arbiter, chief."

V. 231–234. Hesychius makes *δόζοι*=*μάγειροι, ὑπηρέται, θεράποντες*; here, therefore, the sacrificial servants, assistants or attendants of the priests.—*μετ' εὐχάν*, nach Götteranruf, after having invoked the Gods.—*δίκαν* (Dorice=*δίκην*) *χιμαίρας*, "after the manner of, like a kid," i. e., as they were wont to do when sacrificing a kid. The accusative of this passage comes under the category of that of the "*remote* or *intended* effect, i. e., it involves the notion of a tendency towards itself as the aim or end of the action denoted by the predicate. The *manner* of doing a thing is made, as it were,

the goal of the doing itself. Hence the absence of prepositions in such expressions as *τοῦτον τὸν τρόπον, hunc in modum, ὁμοια, in like manner, δέμας, instar, ἐπιτηδές, consulto*, &c., as also in *ἀναγκάζειν τινά τι* and *χρῆσθαι τινί τι*. Cf. Kühner's Gramm. § 549.

περιπετῆ=περιεσκεπασμένην (Schol.), literally "enveloped or shrouded in something that falls (in folds), or is thrown around one"; "umflattert vom Gewand" (Voss), i. e., "enveloped in her garment's fluttering folds."

παντὶ θυμῷ, forte animo, audacter, German "rüstig"; or it may=*ὅλῃ δυνάμει* (Suidas), "with all their might," *omnibus viribus*. This expression is usually and most naturally referred to the sacrificial attendants and connected with *λαβεῖν*. Voss, however, renders it in conjunction with *προνωπῆ*, "*wie sehr sie räng' hinabwärts*," however much she might struggle downward, i. e., to escape their grasp.

προνωπής=pronus, praeceps, bent forward, head foremost, precipitate. The epithet seems here to imply the idea of precipitation and violence, with which the act was performed, and of which the peculiar attitude was only the *result*. Hence Humboldt translates it with *λαβεῖν*, "forwärts schwingen," i. e., to hurry or swing onward; and Schneider remarks: *προνωπῆ* is proleptical for *ὥστε προνωπῆ γενέσθαι*. But there is another prolepsis in *λαβεῖν ἀέρθην*, as we do not say "to seize aloft," but "to seize for the purpose of raising aloft," or "to seize and raise aloft." It is thus, that the poet with his peculiar conciseness presents to us a complete picture of every stage of the terrific act.—The father commands the ministers of sacrifice courageously to seize, precipitate along and raise aloft upon the altar, as they were wont to raise the sacrificial kid, the maid enveloped in her garment's fluttering folds. The fact that the intended victim of the sacrificial knife was a human one, and besides the cherished daughter of the chief commander himself; moreover, the presence of the reluctantly, sorrow-stricken parent on the spot, would naturally produce a feeling of timid hesitation in the minds of those charged with the performance of the rite; hence the motive for the

poet's introduction of the words *παντὶ θυμῷ*, in the sense we have given them above.

V. 236–237. *στόματός τε καλλιπρῴρου*, i. e., *στομ' καλῆς πρῴρας*. Concerning the expression *φυλαχὰν κατασχεῖν* there are several opinions. Schütz makes *φυλαχάν=φύλακας* and the subject of the infinitive: *eosque (tanquam) custodes oris formosi vocem ..... comprimere.* In like manner Schneider has: *dass Verwahrung hemme* i. e., that a preventing care or guard might check. But *φυλαχὰν κατασχεῖν* must, like the well known *φυλακὴν ἔχειν* of Herodotus, here be regarded as one phrase, equivalent to *φυλάττεσθαι* or rather *φυλάττειν*, to have a care, a watchful eye upon, to guard, check, prevent. The expression then depends, like *λαβεῖν*, on the principal verb of the sentence (on *φράσεν*, of v. 231,) and has *φθόγγον* for its object, in other words, *φθόγγον* is the immediate object of the verbal action still inherent in the substantive *φυλαχάν*. Cf. Kühner's Gramm. § 553, Anm. 5.

ἀραῖον, curse-laden, calamitous, of direful import to the royal house. So Sophocles in Medea, v. 608, *σοῖς ἀραία γ' οὖσα τυγχάνω δόμοις*. "Cavere volebat Agamemnon, ne Iphigeniae forte dirae aut imprecationes exciderent, quae damnum essent generi suo illaturae." Schütz.

V. 238. *βίᾳ χαλινῶν τ' ἀναύδῳ μένει*, by violence and speechless (i. e., speech-preventing) force of bridle. These words are undoubtedly to be referred to the preceding sentence, as descriptive of the means, by which she was to be prevented from giving utterance to an imprecation on the royal house, or to any sound portentous of evil to those around. Thus Schütz, Humboldt, Voss, and others. But Schneider and Haupt, unwilling to suffer the new strophe to begin with the part of an unfinished sentence, connect the verse with what follows, thus making the dative expressive of the cause or reason of, her casting the pitiful glance at her immolators: "owing to, by reason of the violence done to her person and the speech-stifling force of the gag, &c."

χαλινῶν, "*frenorum*, h. e., vittarum seu veli, quo obvolvi jussit os filiae, ne ejularet." Blomfield.

V. 239. *χρόκου βαφάς, the safron's dye or tint.* What this dye or tint was or had reference to, the poet himself gives us no further information. Humboldt takes the same poetic liberty in an equally indefinite rendering of the line: "*des Safran's Tünchung zu Boden giessend*, i. e., pouring the safron's dye upon the ground." The most obvious inference would be that this was the blood of Iphigenia, to which moreover the very same epithet is applied in verse 1092, *ἐπὶ καρδίαν ἔδραμε χροκοβαφὴς στάγων*. So Schneider and others. Schütz, however, cites Pers. 660 *χροκόβαπτον ποδὸς εὔμαριν* and the *χρόκεον εἷμα* of Pindar, and adds: "*χρόκου βαφαὶ* sunt velamenta croco tincta. Hoc loco autem *vittae* seu *infulae* intelliguntur, Iphigeniae, ut hostiae, more solenni impositae." This opinion of Schütz is adopted by Bothe, Voss, Haupt and others, all of whom render: "dropping her safron-tinted fillets, veil or robe." To establish the legitimacy of the peculiar use of *χέουσα*, which ordinarily designates the pouring of liquids alone, the Homeric *κατέχευεν πέπλον* of Iliad V. 734 is quoted. As regards the use of the word *βαφή*, its well established and ordinary significations are: 1st *the act of dipping*, e. g., either red hot iron into the water for the purpose of tempering it, or stuffs into colouring matter; hence 2dly *the act or process of coloring or dyeing;* and 3dly the *coloring matter or dye itself.* But of its ever being used to designate the *material* or *stuff* thus coloured or dyed, we have no example. The words of this sentence, therefore, taken each in its ordinary and legitimate signification, are decidedly in favor of the first rendering, and as the shedding of the victim's blood is a more indispensable concomitant of the sacrificial rite, than the dropping of the robe or fillets, (which by the way could scarcely have reached the ground from the altar), we see no reason whatever for adopting the second. It was after she had already been struck with the knife and when her safron-tinted blood was already flowing, that she yet smote each of her immolators with a pity-wooing shaft from her eye, mute and lovely like a painted martyr-saint of later times. (In the whole of this

description the poet seems to proceed upon the supposition of the actual immolation of the princess, and to be unacquainted with, or to ignore, the well known fable of a miraculous substitution.)

V. 241–244. *πρεπουσά θ' ὡς ἐν γραφαῖς, spectanda ut in tabulis.* To this the Scholiast correctly adds *διὰ τὸ κάλλος ἢ διὰ τὸ ἀφωνητεῖν.* "Muta erat Iphigenia, eademque venusta, atque adeo pictae similis." Blomfield. So the Germans say: "*bildschön*," "*wie gemalt*," i. e., artistically beautiful, charming like a picture; "reizend als im Kunstgemälde" (Voss), and Euripides Hecuba v. 564 has *στέρνα, ὡς ἀγάλματος, κάλλιστα.* Whether the poet here makes any allusion to actual works of art commemorative of this event, and existing in his time at Athens, is a matter of uncertainty, though not impossible.

προσεννέπειν θέλουσ', haud secus ac si principes sacrificantes alloqui vellet, quod tamen ei non licebat.—*ἐπεὶ πολλάκις πατρός, κ. τ. λ.* "hoc ideo additur, ut appareat, quo modo Iphigenia familiariter adspicere principes Graecorum, quasi allocutura, potuerit: non ignotos enim compellasset, cum saepe in patris coeniculis opiparis post coenam, ad quam illi duces invitati essent, patris jussu cantasset." Schütz. The object of *προσεννέπειν* is here again left indefinite and to be inferred from what proceeds. There is, moreover, manifestly an ellipsis in the sentence, which must be supplied in order to give *ἐπεί* its proper force: desiring (once more) to address (sc., the chieftain-friends of her royal sire), as often she had done before, when in her father's sumptuously furnished banquet-halls, she had delighted them with songs.

ἔμελφεν is the reading of the Glasgow edition, of Schütz, Blomfield and others, instead of the older and unintelligible *ἔμελθεν* and *ἔμελλεν*. This Hermann has again unnecessarily emended into *ἔμαχθεν*, which led Humboldt into the error of translating: "Verlangend noch, wie sonst, nach Anrede, weil sie oft im Männergemach des Vaters versammelt einst weilten."

V. 244–246. *ἀγνὰ δ' . . . . ἑτέρμα.* The *δέ* is here again

equivalent to γάρ. Cf. Note to v. 185.—ἁγνά is the common and most ancient lection, which Schütz and Blomfield after him have corrupted into ἁγνᾷ, in order to make it agree with αὐδᾷ. This is entirely inexcusable. The nominative by far preferable; and of the two adjectives ἁγνα ἀταύρωτος we may either take one substantively, as Schneider suggests, or both may be regarded as synonymous epithets belonging to the subject, ("*she*," or "the maiden") to be supplied from the context. Nor is there any need of changing the universally adopted αὐδᾷ, "with her voice," into Ἀδᾷ, "by her death," as Hermann would have it, who (together with Humboldt) misapprehends the meaning of the sentence altogether, by referring it to a willingness on the part of Iphigenia to die for the purpose of winning glory for her father under the walls of Troy, when it manifestly is nothing more than an expansion of the previous lines, by which the poet intends to account for her frequent singing in the paternal halls. The cause of this was, as he imforms us, nothing more or less than her fondness for celebrating with her voice the happy lot of her beloved father, whose life was one of perpetual merriment and regal splendor.

ἀταύρωτος, *viri expers*, ἄζευκτος, παρθενική (Schol.), the unmarried one, spotless virgin.—τριτόσπονδον· πολλὰς θυσίας ποιοῦντα καὶ εὐωχίας καὶ συμπόσια (Scholiast). The word strictly signifies: "having, affording, or abounding in, the third libation," which it was customary to pour to Jupiter Σωτήρ at banquets and other convivial entertainments. The life, therefore, that could at any time afford a third libation might from the stand-point of the ancients be called a *blessed* one, either (as the Scholiast indicates) from the material consideration of its abounding in banquets and symposia, which even philosophers regarded as one of the causes of felicitation, or else because such a life was under the immediate protection of Jupiter Σωτήρ, to whom that libation, under the name of τρίτος κρατήρ, was dedicated, and after which he himself was called Ζεὺς σωτὴρ τρίτος, Suppl. v. 27. Blomfield shows, by a quotation from

Antiphanes, that during this libation it was customary to have a paean sung, and it was perhaps this consideration that induced Haupt to render τριτόσπονδον by: *dum tertia fiebat libatio*, not without considerable plausibility.

φίλως ἐτίμα, "she was wont to celebrate with alacrity, she loved to celebrate, was fond of doing so."

V. 247. τὰ δ' ἔνθεν, "interpretor, *quae inde secutura sint*, (ut saepe apud Aristotelem τὰ ἐντεῦθεν sunt, quae inde sequuntur) ut his verbis contineatur suspicio quaedam de Agamemnonis fortuna." *The consequences of this act* (with reference to the fate of Agamemnon, namely) *I neither know nor venture to relate.*" This is most probably the meaning. It may, however, also be rendered: *quae secuta sunt seu quae inde facta, neque vidi neque dico*, with reference to the further particulars of the sacrifice. These the chorus neither saw nor was willing to relate, either because they were out of place here, or as the Scholiast suggests διὰ τὸ ἀπάνθρωπον εἶναι τὴν σφαγήν. A graphic description is furnished by Euripides Iphig. Aulica v. 1390, seqq, and another by Lucretius De Rer. Natura, Lib. I. v. 84.

V. 249. δίκα δὲ . . . . τὸ μέλλον. This passages has been interpreted in various ways: "Justitia autem iis, qui mala perpessi sunt, seram ex damno sapientiam appendit." Schütz. "Justitia illis, qui mala passi sunt, futura adducit, ut cognoscant." Wellauer. "Justitia illis, qui mala perpessi sunt, hoc tribuit, ut inde discant." Blomfield. "Auch Dike wägt traun den Leiderduldenden Belehrung zu für künftig," i. e., "and Diké too deals surely out to those who suffer, instruction for the future." Voss.—τοῖς μὲν πεπονθόσι ἡ δίκη δίδωσι τὸ μαθεῖν. Δίκην γὰρ δόντες μανθάνουσι τὸ μέλλον. Scholiast. We omit many others that are even less in accordance with the context. If we examine the passage closely, it will appear that τὸ μέλλον must here necessarily be taken as the object of ἐπιῤῥέπει. It signifies either the *future generally*, or else *the allotments of the future, future destiny* as ordained by Jove; and this is the sense in which the Scholiast seems to have regarded the word, when in v. 245 he explains it by adding: τὸ πεπρωμένον

φανερὸν ἥξει. It is likewise evident from the position of μαθεῖν, that it is grammatically dependent on παθοῦσαν, and that it here may be considered as =ὥστε μαθεῖν. This construction will give us a sense in perfect harmony with what precedes, and the transition to what follows will likewise be natural and easy. The chorus then wishes to say: "The consequences of this act, however, I have not yet lived to witness, nor do I pretend to say what they will be." At all events, the prophecies of Kalchas will not be unfulfilled, and Dikè will mete out (ἐπιῤῥέπει for the fut. ἐπιῤῥέψει, lit. "will weigh out") with even hand their future lot to them (i. e., to the immolators of Iphigenia and to Agamemnon especially) at least, who suffer to learn wisdom (whom sad experience is to teach what's right). But to foreknow this (future lot), and what its end will be (ᾗ λύσις), I bid farewell to that (let that go to the Deuce!); 't were equal to the lamenting it beforehand."

As a grammatical peculiarity of the passage, the μέν *solitarium* after the demonstrative τοῖς deserves to be noticed. The adversative δέ, which ordinarily follows μέν as its correlative, is here omitted, or rather the entire adversative clause, to which δέ would belong, is suppressed and must be mentally supplied. Hence τοῖς becomes emphatic by its connection with μέν: *to them at least* Dikè will weigh out, etc. Whether it will do so to the others, I am not sure, or: to others perhaps not. Cf. Kühner's Gramm. § 734, 2.

V. 251. This verse has been one of the most corrupt and difficult passages in the entire choral ode. The text of the different Mss. varies enormously and savors of interpolations. In the Farnesian Codex, one of the oldest and most important, the words τὸ δὲ προχλύειν are entirely wanting, which led Elmsley and Blomfield to the hasty conclusion that they were to be rejected as a gloss. Hence Blomfield connects τὸ μέλλον δ' ἐπεὶ οὐ γένοιτ' ἂν λύσις προχαιρέτω, without, however, giving any satisfactory explanation of the sense he intended to convey. Nay, his "*futura vero sciscitari, quandoquidem horum nullum est effugium, valeat!*" is a contradiction of his own text, in which he has rejected the

very word (*προκλύειν*) that still forms a part of his translation. The difficulty, therefore, does not lie in *τὸ προκλύειν*, which is not only found in all the Mss., except in the one, mentioned above, (where its omission may be regarded as accidental,) but is absolutely indispensable to make any sense whatever of the passage. But the words that intervened between *τὸ προκλύειν* and *προχαιρέτω* were so corrupt as to be entirely unintelligible. They are: *ἐπιγένοιτ' ἂν κλύος* (or *ἀνκλύος*); in others *ἐπεὶ γένοιτ' ἂν ἡ λύσις*. I omit mentioning the conjectures and emendations of the various editors. The most common was: *τὸ δὲ προκλύειν, ἐπεὶ γένοιτ' ἂν ἧλυσις, προχαιρέτω*. It was Hermann who in his note to Humboldt's translation first proposed to reject *ἐπεὶ γένοιτ'* altogether as an interpolation, and to read *τὸ προκλύειν δ' ἥλυσιν προχαιρέτω, voraus das Ende zu vernehmen sei wir fern!* (Humboldt) "Far be it from me to learn the end beforehand!" and in his late edition (i. e. his posthumous Aeschylus) he still retains this reading. Bothe and Schneider both agree with Hermann in regarding the *ἐπεὶ γένοιτ'* as hurtful to sense and reason both; but they retain the *λύσις* of the Mss., not without propriety. Schneider has: *τὸ δὲ προκλύειν ἢ λύσις προχαιρέτω*, "to learn this (i. e. future destiny) before the solution (of the plot), farewell to that!"—The *ἤ* in this reading denotes a comparison of time in connection with the *πρό* of the verb *προκλύειν*, and is equivalent to the more common *πρόσθεν ἤ* or *πρὶν ἤ sooner than, before*. Bothe, finally, reads *τὸ δὲ προκλύειν, ἦ λύσις, προχαιρέτω, praescire autem quae sit solutio*, i. e. finis harum rerum, *valeto*!—an emendation which not only offers us the simplest grammatical construction, but approximates more closely than any other to the original form of these obscure words as they are presented by the Mss. It is on this account, that I am inclined to give it a place in the text in preference to Hermann's. The *λύσις*=the *solution*, as it were of this intricate problem, the *dénouement*, as the French would say, of these events, the *end* of these things.

V. 252. *τῷ προστένειν· ὁ γὰρ προγινώσκων τὸ μέλλον* (=*πεπρωμένον*) *καὶ προστενάζει.* Scholiast.—*ἴσον* may either be ta-

ken adverbially (=ἴσως or ἴσα), as it often occurs in Homer and in all the Attic writers, with the dative, in the sense of "like, as well as": "Farewell to that, i. e., the foreknowledge of the future, as well as (and likewise) to premature lamenting." Thus Schneider. Or perhaps better, ἴσον is here an adjective, δέ=γάρ, and the clause assigns the cause or reason for the preceding προχαιρέτω: *tandundem enim esset gemituum anticipatio.* The verb προστένειν in the sense of "lamenting, groaning beforehand or prematurely," occurs in Prometh. v. 695 (Ed. Tauchnitz): πρόχει στενάζεις, καὶ φόβου πλέα τίς εἶ.

V. 253. τορόν=φανερόν, *clare*: τὸ πεπρωμένον φανερὸν ἥξει. (Schol.). This passage has been hideously mutilated by the commentators. Schütz corrupts it into ξύναρθρον αἴτιαι, *clare enim omnia evenient noxis convenientia*, quod ad noxam Agamemnonis ex immolatione filiae contractam pertineret." Hermann conjectures αὐγαῖς for ἄϋτας, in accordance with which Humboldt renders: "*Und sicher kommt es dem Tag entsprechend*, i. e. and surely it will come, coinciding with the day," i. e. on the very day (of its prediction). Wellauer reads σύνορθρον αὐγαῖς, *simul cum matutinis diei radiis.* Blomfield after Guelf. Ald. Rob. Turn. and Stanley: σύναρθρον αὐταῖς, referring αὐταῖς to the predictions of Kalchas, the τέχναι of v. 248. This reference, however, is far too remote. I prefer to adopt the σύναρθρον ἄϋταῖς of Flor. and Farn., which the glossa to Farn. correctly explains by συνηρμοσμένον βοαῖς καὶ θρήνοις.—σύναρθρον, better than the unintelligible σύνορθρον—*connexum, consonum, congruens:* "metaphora ab ossium junctura sumpta" (Blomf.). "For it, i. e. the dark lot of the future, will come distinctly (will manifest itself clearly), accompanied by sounds of wail (zusammenstimmend mit Klagetönen—Schneider)." The chorus therefore means to say, that he desires not to learn beforehand and prematurely the precise nature or the details of the πεπρωμένον of Agamemnon. Of one general fact, however, he feels assured, which is, that it will be a mournful fate, and that its arrival will be distinctly announced by the voices of lamentation and distress with which it will be attended.

V. 255. *τἀπὶ τούτοισιν*: either "after these events, subsequently, thereafter, quod futura attinet," or else "besides, after all, in other respects."—*εὔπραξις*=*εὐπραξία* (Scholiast), or according to Photius the *εὐπραγία* of the later Greeks: *secundus rerum exitus.* The propriety of the use of this word has been questioned by Lobeck ad Phryn. p. 501, and Schneider too suggests the substitution of *εὐ πρᾶξις*. "Sed *εὔπραξις* defensum est in Parisina editione Thesauri Stephani in v. *εὐθεράπευσις*." Hermann.—The chorus here simply expresses the hope, that Agamemnon, after having suffered the inevitable consequences of this deed, might yet be happy and prosperous. "May then at least thereafter be prosperity, or may then at least in other respects the lot of Agamemnon and his house be still a happy one." We have here to supply a dative of the remote subject: "May there be," (sc. to Agamemnon), &c., i. e. "may he have," &c.

V. 255–257. *ὡς . . . . ἔρκος*. Many of the older commentators, and among the more recent Blomfield and Bothe have fallen into the egregious error of applying this language to the old men of the chorus: "Senes de semet ipsis loquuntur," says Blomfield. The prologue of the Persae is cited in support of this opinion, and, sure enough, the Scholiast gives likewise as an explanation of the words *μονόφρουρον ἔρκος· ἐπειδὴ μόναι γέροντες ἐφύλασσον τὴν Ἑλλάδα*. Hinc illae lacrymae! But no one will pretend to claim infallibility for the Scholiast, who certainly is mistaken here. The chorus is composed of subjects, to whom no power could have been delegated by their absent master, and who, at all events, could never have been guilty of the stolidity of using such unbecoming, boastful language in the presence of their advancing queen; to say nothing of the inconsistency of the poet in making the same old men, who in v. 82 complain of the utter imbecility and helplessness of age (calling themselves but an *ὄναρ ἡμερόφαντον*), appear here in v. 246 at once transferred into the *μονόφρουρον ἔρκος* of the state! Klytemnestra was the sole representative of the royal power in the absence of her husband, as the next

following verses conclusively show, and to her alone the epithets of this sentence can with any sort of propriety be applied.—*ἄγχιστον* is by the Scholiast correctly made= *συγγενικόν*, *cognatum*, the "nearest relative" of Agamemnon, not *proximum* in a local sense, much less *Argis natum* or *Argivum*, as those who apply this passage to the chorus would have it. Thus Herodotus V. 79 has *οἱ ἄγχιστα* in the same sense, and Euripides Troad. V. 48 *τὸν γένει ἄγχιστον πατρός*. The *locality* of the approaching queen is already sufficiently pointed out by the demonstrative *τόδ'*: As most earnestly desires that (yonder) nearest relative of his (i. e. of Agammenon), sole-watching bulwark of the Apian land."

The *Ἀπία γαῖη* of Aeschylus, also called *Ἀπία* simply, is a name of the Peloponnesos, and more particularly of Argolis, and is derived from *Ἄπις*, an ancient fabulous king of that region. This must carefully be distinguished from the *ἀπία γαίη* of Homer, Il. I, 270; Odyss. VII, 25, and id. XVI, 18, which, as Buttmann (Lexilogos Vol. I p. 67), has shown, is derived from the preposition *ἀπό*, and signifies "the distant land." So does the *τὰν' ἀπίαν γᾶν* of Sophocl. Oed. Col. v. 1668 (ed. Wunder), where the Scholiast correctly explains by *τὴν μακρὰν καὶ ἀπωθεν οὖσαν*. But there is not only a difference of origin, but also a difference of quantity in these words, the Alpha of *Ἀπία* being long, whilst that of *ἀπίη* is short. Blomfield in his note to this passage not only confounds the proper name and the general term, but the very passages, which he cites, all go to prove the opposite of his assertion. The remark of the Schol. Ven. would be correct, if applied to our passage or to Soph. Oed. Col. 1298, but to Il. I, 270, or to any other place in Homer, where *ἀπίη* occurs, it is a blunder, such as Scholiasts have often made. So it would be to Oed. Col. 1668, quoted above. In opposition to the Schol. Ven. I advance Hesychius to Odyss. VII, 25, who interprets the *τηλόθεν ἐξ ἀπίης γαίης* by *ἀλλοτρίας, ἢ ξένης, ἢ μακρὰν οὔσης*. Just so Strabo, p. 371; and Eustathius to Iliad III defines: *Ἀπία δέ γῆ κἀνταῦθα, ὡς ἐν τῇ ἀ π ο ἀ φ ε σ τ ῶ σ α, καὶ ἀ λ λ ο π α δ ή, καὶ ὡς ἂν εἴποι τις Ὁμηρικὸς τ η λ ο ῦ ἀ π ὸ*

Τροίας· κατὰ δὲ ἄλλους φάναι ποιητής, ἡ τηλουρός. οἱ μὲν νεώτεροι τὴν Πελοπόννησον φασιν ἀπό τινος Ἄπιδος ἢ Ἄπεως. With respect to the proper name "Apis," its origin and quantity, Hermann ad. Oed. Col. 1298 (ed. Wunder) remarks: "Rex fuerat Peloponnesi, a quo tota Peloponnesus nomen Apiae terrae accepit. Ex iis quae de eo rege Aeschylus Suppl. 260 seqq. (ed. Tauchnitz) refert, intelligitur nomen illud *τὸν ἥπιον* ("the kind, gentle one") significare, fabulamque illam ad vitae humarioris cultum in illis locis introductum spectare. Simul apparet magis cum ea nominis derivatione productionem primae syllabae adjectivi *Ἄπιος*, quae tragicis usitata est, quam correptionem, quae Epicis placuit, convenire."

V. 258. To this and the five subsequent verses we find *ἄγγελος* prefixed in the codices Guelf. Bess. Flor. and by the *secunda manu* of Cod. Medic.; the same in the printed editions Ald. Turn. Vict.—The Codex Farn. has *ἄγγελος φύλαξ*, and Robertellus *φύλαξ* simply. "Ineptissime!" says Schütz correctly, who adopts Stanley's substitution of the name of the chorus. But this even is unnecessary. These verses are so closely linked to the conclusion of the ode, that it would be absurd to attribute them to any one but to the chorus. Roused from his melancholy musings on the probable destiny of the royal house by the approach of the queen, and mindful of the duties of loyalty, he respectfully advances to meet her, saluting her with his *ἥκω σεβίζων σὸν κράτος*! "With reverence I approach your majesty!" The change of measure from the intricate windings of the strophe to the precise and stately marching matter of-fact Iambics of the dialogue is in keeping with the change of subjects and has an admirable effect. It is this transition undoubtedly, that misled the copyists and earlier editors, who saw not its necessity, into the absurd error of attributing these verses to another personage.

V. 259. The word *ἀρχηγός* (also *ἀρχηγέτης*, from *ἀρχή* & *ἡγέομαι*) commonly signifies "author, originator, founder, progenitor," &c. So Epist. ad Heb. c. 2, v. 10 *τὸν ἀρχηγὸν τῆς σωτηρίας*; here, however, it is "leader, chief, sovereign,"

as in Eurip. Iphig. Taur. 1304 *ἀρχηγὸς χθονός*, and Troad. 1258 *ἀρχηγοὶ στρατοῦ*. Cf. Blomf. Gloss. p. 250.

V. 260. The term *ἄρσενος* may either be taken as an adjective agreeing with *θρόνου*, *orbato virili solio*, "wenn verwaiset steht der Männerthron" (Humboldt), or perhaps better as a substantive governed by *ἐρημωθέντος*, *throno a viro vacuo relicto*. So Eurip. Hec. 883 *πῶς γυναιξὶν ἀρσένων ἔσται κράτος*, and id. v. 1017 *ἀρσένων ἐρημία*. Klausen infers from Odyss. VI, 303, seqq., that both the king and the queen had each a separate throne, and then the vacancy here expressed would apply to one of them only: "the male, (.i e., husband's) throne." But the fact in question is not sufficiently established, and the correctness of such an inference from the above passage of the Odyssey may justly be questioned. The Scholiast too assumes one throne only. His remark to *ἐρημωθέντος* is: *ἦγουν ἐρήμου καταλειφθέντος, ὡς ἀποδημοῦντος τοῦ βασιλέως· παρόντος μέντοι οὐ δεῖ συντυγχάνειν αὐτῇ*. To this may be added, that *θρόνος* in Homer does not necessarily mean a "seat of power or throne" in the present acceptation of the term, but more generally a "chair, arm-chair, fauteuil"; its restricted signification is post-homeric.

V. 261. *εἴ τι κεδνόν* is the conjecture of Auratus, adopted by Blomfield, and likewise preferred by Hermann to the more common *εἴτε κεδνόν*. The latter is found in all the Mss., except in the Medicean (the best), where, as Hermann remarks, the last letter of *εἴτε* is an "ε" *e correctione*. In defense of the *εἴ τι* Hermann says: "Est id aptius, licet defendi possit *εἴτε*;" and Blomfield: "Sensus non est, sive audisti sive non, sed potius, Lubens discam num audieris necne."—The word *κεδνός*, when said of news, is the opposite of *κακός*, and="favorable, lucky, good." Thus Blomf. and Passow. But its primary signification is "careful, discreet, reliable, faithful;" and in a passive sense generally "that on which care is expended (from *κήδομαι*), dear, venerable, respected"; hence, when said of intelligence, it may mean "carefully ascertained, sure, reliable." This is the sense, in which Humboldt takes it, and probably the true one here.

In v. 262 *πῶς δῆτ' ἂν εἰπὼν κεδνὰ τἀληθῆ τύχοις*, it appears to be the same, but in v. 648 it is opposed to *κακός*.—That the participle *πεπυσμένη* has here an active or rather middle sense, it is scarcely necessary to remark, it being a general rule of Greek Grammar, that the form of the perf. and pluperf. passive, as well as that of the present and imperf., is identical with the same tenses of the middle. Cf. Rost's Greek Gramm. p. 568.

V. 262. *εὐαγγέλοισιν ἐλπίσιν* may either be: "with hopes excited by good news, or with hopes that are the messengers of good tidings," "spes quae bona nuntiant," as in Euripides Phoen. 1224 *ἐς εὐαγγέλου φήμης*; or lastly, it may = *εὐαγγελίας ἐλπίσιν*, "in hopes, in expectation of good news," as Eurip. Med. 1010, *δόξης δ' ἐσφάλην εὐαγγέλου*, where Wunder makes *δόξα εὐάγγελος*=*δόξα ἀγαθῆς ἀγγελίας*. The last rendering (undoubtedly the true one here) is adopted by Schütz, Humboldt and also by Kühner, who (Ausf. Gramm. § 473. Anm.), after citing a number of parallel passages, justly remarks: "This mode of construction sets forth in an ingenious manner the intimate union subsisting between the substantive and its attributive modifications. It is moreover characterized by a certain boldness and elevation of expression, which are truly poetical. Hence its frequent occurrence in Tragical and Lyric poetry, while in Comedy and in Prose (with the single exception of Herodotus) it is rarely found." The passage is elegantly given by Humboldt:

> "Ob sichre Botschaft spähend, oder ungewiss
> Du erst in froher Kunde Hoffnung opferest,
> Vernähm' ich gern."
>
> If certain news descrying, or uncertain yet
> Thou erst in hope of glad despatch dost sacrifice,
> I'd gladly learn.

But why should the queen offer sacrifices, if she was not certain that the news were favorable? To this Stanley replies: "Etiam in re incerta et dubia sacrificabant *εὐαγγέλια*," in proof of which he cites the language of Klytemnestra in v. 578, and the Scholiast's note to Aristoph. Equit.—*ἦθον ἦν τοῖς ἐν ἀγυιαῖς ἱσταμένοις θεοῖς ἐπὶ ταῖς ἐρχομέναις*

ἀγγελίαις θύειν, ὡς ἂν εἰ ἀγαθαὶ εἶεν, ἐπινεύσαιεν ταύταις, εἰ δὲ τοὐναντίον, ἀποτρέψαιεν." The standing expression for this religious act was εὐαγγέλια θύειν, concerning which cf. Spanheim's note and Kühner's Gramm. § 547, 2. The verb θυηπολεῖν is here equivalent to θύειν, as in Eurip. Electra 665, ἵνθ' θυηπολεῖ θεοῖς, and id. v. 1134 οὗ πόσις θυηπολεῖ Νύμφαισιν.—The adjective εὔφρων may either be *lubens*, I should be glad to hear, or perhaps better *benevolus erga te*, as Blomfield has it, i. e., I your friend, or with friendly intentions, I should like to learn. By the phrase οὐδὲ σιγώσῃ φθόνος, *neque tamen tacenti* (*tibi*) *invidia*, the chorus means to say, that he deferentially submits it to the pleasure of the queen, either to communicate the intelligence in her possession, or to keep it to herself, as she had a right to do. Hence the Scholiast correctly: εἰ μὴ θέλεις εἰπεῖν, οὐ μεμφαίμην ἄν.

V. 264–265. παροιμία· παλαιὸς λόγος, Schol. The ancient proverb seems to have been γένοιτο καλὴ ἡμέρα, ὥσπερ ἡ νύξ, as would appear from the Scholiast. This originated in the general opinion of the Ancients, that night was the mother of day. So Hesiod Theog. 123, ἐκ Χάεος δ' Ἔρεβός τε μέλαινά τε Νὺξ ἐγένοντο, Νυκτὸς δ' αὖτ' Αἰθήρ τε καὶ Ἡμέρη ἐξεγένοντο; and Thales in reply to the inquiry, which was first in the order of origination, night or day, is reported to have said: "Night is older by one day." The term εὐφρόνη, lit. "the propitious, kindly, friendly one," is euphemistic, and particularly frequent in the later poets, instead of νύξ, with which the Greeks associated the idea of darkness and of terror. To this cosmological conception in regard to the precedence of night may perhaps be referred the custom of the Atheneans to compute the commencement of their day from the eve or sun-set of the preceding (Aul. Gell. iii, 2.), a custom, which seems to have been pretty generally prevalent among Barbarous nations even. So Caesar with reference to the Gauls (Lib. vi, c. 18) remarks: "Dies natales, et mensium et annorum initia sic observant, ut noctem dies subsequatur;" and Tacitus of the Germans (Germ. c. 11.): "Nec dierum numeros, ut nos,

sed noctium computant." Cf. Blomfield. In the Germanic mythology we likewise find a myth similar to that of the Greeks. According to the Edda, *Nôtt*, the daughter of Noervi the *joetunn* (i. e. the giant), black and swarthy, like all her race, bore to Dellîngr, the last of her husband's and of Odin's race, a son *Dâgr*, of light complexion and fair, like all his paternal progenitors. Cf. Grimm Deutsche Mythol. c. 16.

The optative *γένοιτο* may here either be regarded as expressive of a wish, in the sense *εἴθε* (*εἰ γὰρ*) *γένοιτο*! "An harbinger of gladness may this morning's light be born of mother night, as saith the ancient saw!" Or it may be made=*γένοιτ' ἄν*, to denote an indefinite possibility, and then the passage would read: "The rosy morn, as goes the saw, may indeed (*μέν*) become (as it generally does,) a messenger of joy from kindly mother night, but this time you will learn (*πεύσει δέ*)" &c., &c. This construction has the advantage of admitting the usual antithetical force of *μέν* and *δέ*, and the comparison thus instituted between the blessings, which morning ordinarily and of itself brings, and the preëminently joyful news, which this particular morning is expected to announce, adds greatly to the exaltation of the latter. Cf. Kühner's Gramm. § 466, *b*; and § 467, 2.

V. 266. The construction *μεῖζον ἐλπίδος κλύειν* deserves to be noticed more particularly. In the first place, we have here a peculiar form of comparison, of which the second member is not, as is ordinarily the case, a simple term, like the first, but of a complex nature, containing an entire sentence compressed in one substantive, which, as usually, is put in the genitive after the comparative. Thus Herodotus says of the Pyramids, that they are *λόγου μέζονες* i. e., *grandiores quam ut oratione explicari possit*, when he might equally correctly say (*ἦσαν .... αἱ πυραμίδες*) *μέζονες, ἢ λέξαι λόγῳ*. So Eurip. Suppl. 854 has *χρείσσων', ἢ λέξαι λόγῳ, τολμήμαθ'*, and Hec. 1089 *χρείσσον', ἢ φέρειν, καλά, graviora quam quae ferri possint*; or with the opt. and *ὡς*:

μέζονες, ἤ ὡς τῷ λόγῳ τις ἂν εἴποι. In the same way Sophoc. Oed. T. 1339 has *ἐμοὶ ἔργ' ἐστὶ κρείσσον' ἀγχόνης εἰργασμένα, atrociora admisi scelera, quam quae suspendio lui possint*, as Brunck correctly explains, and in v. 1349 of this play our poet has again *ὄψος κρεῖσσον ἐκπηδήματος, altitudine majus quam quod transiliri queat.* Cf. Kühner's Gramm. § 751. The second point is that *κλύειν* is dependent, not on *μεῖζον*, but on *ἐλπίδος*, or rather on the complex verbal notion involved in it. The infinitive after abstract substantives denoting an affection of the mind, is a common construction in Greek, but the substantive ordinarily stands in connection with *εἶναι* or *γίγνεσθαι*, so as to form one verbal expression with it, e. g. Eurip. Orest. 770 *μολόντι δ' ἐλπὶς ἐστὶ σωθῆναι κακῶν*; and Alcest. 304 *οὔτε ἐλπὶς ἦν* (sc. *μοι*) *ἄλλα φυτύσειν τέκνα.* Cf. Kühner's Gramm. § 641, c.—The entire expression *μεῖζον ἐλπίδος κλύειν* would therefore be = *μεῖζον, ἢ σοι ἐλπὶς ἐστι, κλύειν*, or *μεῖζον, ἢ ὥστ' ἂν ἐλπίσαις κλύειν*, "greater than (is your) hope to hear, greater than you could expect to hear."

V. 268. *πῶς φῄς*; *Quid ais?* "Formula diffidentis et re improvisa perculsi." Cf. Eurip. Hel. 471 *πῶς φῄς*; *τίν' εἶπας μῦθον*; *αὐθίς μοι φράσον*! and Phoen. 915 *τί φῄς, τίν' εἶπας τόνδε μῦθον, ὦ γέρον*; So also Aeschyl. Choëph. 714 *ὅπως*; *λέγ' αὐθις, ὡς μάθω σαφέστερον*! where Valckenaer proposes to put the more usual *πῶς φῄς* in place of the *ἦ πῶς*; *τί πῶς*; and *ὅπως* of the different editions.

ἐξ ἀπιστίας, prae incredulitate, i. e. what you have said just now is so incredible, that I no longer know what you really did say: "Adeo incredibilia sunt, quae narras, ut audita audivisse mihi non videar." Schütz.—The preposition *ἐξ* may here denote the *reason, consequence*, and *ἀπιστίας* may be taken in a passive sense: *incredibility.*

V. 269. To *Τροίαν' Ἀχαιῶν οὖσαν* we supply *φημί* from the preceding verse. The verba declarandi *λέγω, φράζω, φημί*, &c., are commonly construed with the infinitive, and with the participle only by way of exception. Hence *οὖσαν* = *εἶναι.* Kühner's Gramm. § 658, Anm. 3, b.

V. 270. *χαρά μ' ὑφέρπει, κ. τ. λ.* Tears as the result of

sudden joy are often mentioned by the Greek poets, as, e. g. below, v. 527, and v. 573; Sophoc. Elect. 1212 *γεγηθὸς ἔρπει δάκρυον ὀμμάτων ἄπο*; id 889 and 1294; Homer Odyss. xix. 471 *τὴν δ' ἅμα χάρμα καὶ ἄλγος ἕλε φρένα*, where Eustathius incorrectly attributes this verse of Aeschylus to Sophocles. The much admired *δακρυόεν γελάσασα* of Iliad VI. 484, and the *κλαυσίγελως* of Xenophon are likewise in place here.

V. 271. The sentence to which *γάρ* serves as an explanation is here, as often, omitted, and to be inferred from the context: *yes I see, for*, &c. Kühner's Grammat, § 754.

κατηγορεῖν is not the logical *praedicare, attribuere*, as Casaubon and Spanheim would have it here, but its ordinary signification "to accuse, argue," taken in a good sense is preferable. In the same manner we use the English word to *betray*, i. e., *to indicate*. So Sept. adv. Theb. 406 *ἡ γλῶσσ' ἀληθὴς γίγνεται κατήγορος* and Soph. Ajax 885, when in reply to the enquiry, by whose hand Ajax had fallen, Tekmessa says: "By his own, it's evident," and adds as proof *ἐν γάρ οἱ χθονὶ πηκτὸν τόδ' ἔγχος περιπετὲς κατηγορεῖ*. The verb taken in this sense, comes under the category of those verbs, the activity of which gives rise to an immediate (sensuous or intellectual) perception, and which in Greek are regularly construed with the *participle* and with the infinitive only by way of exception. Cf. Kühner Gramm. § 658. The order is: *ὄμμα γὰρ κατηγορεῖ σου εὖ φρονοῦντος*, "your eye betrays your friendly sympathy."

V. 272. I adopt the punctuation *τί γάρ*; suggested by Schütz and applauded by Hermann, in lieu of the more common *τί γὰρ τὸ πιστ. κ. τ. λ.*—The formula *τί γάρ*; expresses an emphatic question with reference to the language of another, to which some explanation is demanded, and is sometimes, as in this instance, followed by an additional question from the same speaker. It = the Latin *Quid ergo?* German *Wie so? Wie aber?* "How so? But how is this?" Cf. Soph. Oed. Col. 539, 542, 546, and Philoct. 1405. The chorus, not satisfied with the bare announcement of the intelligence received, wishes to know on what sort of evi-

dence the truth of it rested, and resumes with reference to v. 260. *Quid ergo? an tibi hoc est certum hujus rei indicium?* The τό simply indicates, that the predicate πιστόν is the emphatic part of the sentence. Schneider, however, follows Robertellus in putting τἀ instead of τί, i. e., "and is there aught that's certain (reliable) a proof to you of this?" The γάρ in question is frequently thus used in the sense of the German *denn* or of the Latin *nam*, to which the English *and—then*, or *and* simply, generally correspond, sometimes perhaps "pray (tell me)," rarely the ironical *scilicet*, "forsooth." So also πῶς γὰρ οὔ; "and why not?" in the affirmative answer, and πῶς γάρ; or πόθεν γάρ; "and how could I?" i. e., *minime*, "by no means!" in negative answers. In all these expressions, as well as in the optative εἰ γάρ, εἴθε γάρ, "if only! would that!" and in the frequent Attic ἀλλὰ γάρ,, there is an obvious ellipsis of the sentence, to which γάρ serves to introduce either a *reason* or an explanation, sometimes an objection. This ellipsis, or rather this contraction of two propositions into one, is particularly frequent in the Dialogue (in Plato and in the Drama), where the omitted clause may always be supplied, or rather inferred, from what precedes; although the stereotype character of these formulas does not always require us to render a strict account of each separate component, provided we give their equivalent (or something analagous to it) in English. The formula τί γάρ; has, however, sometimes also an argumentative force and = the Latin *quidni enim?* "How could I (you, he, &c.) do otherwise? or: Why not? To be sure!" Cf. Schneider to v. 1119 of this play. The language of the chorus, therefore, might be rendered: "And how could I do otherwise (than shed tears of joy)? Is the certainty of these a sign to you?" But this is not probable, and our other renderings make decidedly the best sense here. Cf. Kühner's Gramm. § 838, i; Rost Gr. Gramm. p. 739; Zumpt. Lat. Gramm. § 769, and Ast ad Platon. Protag. p. 186.

V. 273. ἔστιν, *it is*, i. e., πιστόν. The proof of what I communicated to you *is reliable*. The τί δ' οὐχί; the same

as the more common πῶς γὰρ οὔ; denotes a strong affirmation: "most certainly, why should it not be so?"

The μὴ δολώσαντος θεοῦ is correctly explained by the Scholiast: εἰ μήπω θεός με ἀπατᾷ. The θεός here alluded to may either be Hesphaistos or *a God* in general. "Dictum hoc est ex ea opinione, quae deos non potentia solum sed etiam sapientia mundum regere opinatur, neque a prudentia et calliditate hanc sapientiam discernit. Itaque μηχαναῖς agere dicuntur dii v. 635. Discernitur neque a violentia Deorum potestas, neque a comitate benevolentia, neque a calliditate sapientia." Klausen.

V. 274. The interrogative πότερα (or πότερον) always serves to introduce a double question and should properly be followed by an ἤ, ἤ οὐ, or ἦ μή, as the case may require. The second member of this compound question, however, is sometimes either entirely suppressed, or introduced by a different particle, which in this instance is the ἀλλ' ἤ of v. 267. Cf. Wunder ad Sophoc. Ajac. 452 and Kühner § 836. —εὐπειθῆ, or as Blomf. has it εὐπιθῆ, is here employed in an active sense "easily persuading, i. e., delusive."—σέβειν, "to make much account of," "attach importance to." So Prometh. 526 σέβει θνατοὺς ἄγαν; Eumen. 651 πράγματ' οὐ λαχὼν σέβεις id. 685. τὸ μὴ 'δικεῖν σέβοντες ἐν διαιρέσει.

V. 275. The gen. φρενός may either depend on λάβοιμι or on δόξαν,, without any material alteration of the sense. δόξα, an opinion in a subjective sense, hence one that is liable to be erroneous, a *fancy, delusion.*

V. 276. The formula ἀλλ' ἤ is often used interrogatively, when the question is opposed to some thought present in the mind of the speaker, or when some objection is made in the form of a question. Thus by Plato *passim.* Here, however, it corresponds to the πότερα of v. 265. "Or did perhaps, on the other hand?" &c. Cf. Kühner § 835, 4.

There has been great confusion in regard to the true import of the word ἄπτερος of this passage, as well as of the Homeric expression τῇ δ' ἄπτερος ἑκτο μῦθος, which occurs in Odyss. xvii, 57; xix, 29, xxi, 386; xxii, 397. The synonymous definitions of the later Greeks themselves are

numerous, but vague and destitute of all logical precision. The Scholiast ad h. l. gives *ἰσόπτερος, κούφη* as equipollents. Hesychius makes *ἄπτερα=ἰσόπτερα, ταχέα, ἡδέα.* And again *ἄπτερος· αἰφνίδιος, παρὰ Ὁμήρῳ. ὁ προσηνὴς ἢ ταχύς. Αἰσχύλος Ἀγαμέμνονι· αἰφνίδιον.* The Etymol. Magn. p. 133, 26, defines the *ἄπτερος* of Odyss. xvii, 57 by *ταχὺς πρὸς τὸ πεισθῆναι, καὶ ἰσόπτερος. ἡ γὰρ ἀ στέρησις δηλοῖ καὶ τὸ ὅμοιον καὶ τὸ ἴσον, οἷον ἀτάλαντος, ἄλογος. ἔνιοι δέ, οὐ παραπτάς, ἀλλ' ἔμμονος. ἔνιοι δέ, ἄπτερον τὸ ἡδύ, ἁσμενον, ὀρθόν.* And again on page 133, 34 the Etymologus explains the adverbial form *ἀπτερέως* (of Hesiod, Parmenides, &c.) by *ἀφοφέως. ταχέως. ἑτοίμως, ἀφροντίστως. οἱ δέ, ἀπροθύμως, ἐλαφρῶς. ἔνιοι δέ, ἠμελημένως.* We must resort to the etymology of the word, in order to eliminate from this confused mass of definitions such as are legitimate. This leads us to two distinct significations with various modifications:—

1. With the Alpha Privative, of which *a*). "wingless, i. e. unfledged," as Eurip. Iphig. Taur. 1096 *ἄπτερος ὄρνις*; and Herc. Fur. 1033 *ἄπτερον ὠδῖνα τέκνων* (= *ἀπτέρων ὠδῖνα τέκνων*).

b). "wingless, i. e., without wings," as Aeschylus, Eumenid. 51, said of the Furies, *ἄπτεροί γε μὴν ἰδεῖν*; and Plato's Phaedr. 256 (ed. Ast.), *ἄνθρωπος ζῷον ἄπτερον.*

c.) "wingless, i. e., not accomplished by wings," said of a flight, Aeschyl. Eumenid. 237, *ὑπέρ τε πόντον ἀπτέροις πωτήμασιν ἦλθον.*

d). With reference to the passage from the Odyssey, "wingless," i. e., *οὐ παραπτάς ἀλλ' ἔμμονος, non avolans*, "abiding, fixed, confined." This signification, most probably the true one for Odyss. xvii. 57, admits of two interpretations of that passage. The one is: and the wofd to her was wingless, i. e., "her word was wingless, not a word escaped her lips," where the *ἄπτερος μῦθος* is directly the opposite of the frequent Homeric *ἔπεα πτερόεντα*, "the winged words," such as escaped with winged speed from the lips, to which also the *φύγεν ἕρκος ὀδόντων* is applied.—The other is: "the words (spoken to Penelope) were

ἄπτερος, i. e., ἔμμενος in her mind," she treasured them up, they escaped her not again.

2. The second signification of ἄπτερος (with the Alpha Copulative, after the analogy of ἀτάλαντος, &c.,) is ἰσόπτερος, "winglike, winged," in the sense of either: *a*) ταχύς, "swift, speedy"; or *b*) αἰφνίδιος, "sudden, unexpected;" or lastly *c*) κούφος, ἐλαφρός, fluttering, vague, uncertain, empty." The remaining definitions of the Etymologus ταχὺς πρὸς τὸ πεισθῆναι, ἡδύς, ἄσμενος, etc., are not supported by any examples, and are probably erroneous; certainly so, when applied to the Homeric expression above quoted, or to any passage of Aeschylus, where the word occurs. The meaning then of our ἄπτερος φάτις does not lie far off. It is either an *unfledged*, i. e., uncertain *rumor*, to which no credit is to be given, or else "a swift, sudden, vague, empty rumor." Klausen's ἀνανδὲς φάτις, *praesagitio*, is a contradiction of terms and entirely inadmissible.—That the verb πιαίνειν is here used in a figurative sense, "to fill, possess, satisfy, delight," as in v. 1654, it is scarcely necessary to remark. The verse is evidently closely linked to the last question of the chorus. "Since you discard the idea of placing any confidence in the fleeting visions of dreams, did then perchance some winged report possess your thoughts?"

Art. V.—RELIGIOUS TRAINING; OR THE GOSPEL EDUCATIONAL SYSTEM.

We propose in this paper—essentially supplemental to an article on the Apostolic Commission—to discuss the subject of religious training or the divine method of preparing man for piety and religion here, and for eternal life in the world to come.

All conceivable shades of religious belief and practice may be conveniently ranged under two general heads, thus forming two separate and distinct systems—the one depending, for subsistence, on momentary impulses or animal excitement, by means of the natural will and affections, the other on a spiritual real communion with God in Christ, through the medium of an enlightened faith. The one system is natural, the other supernatural—the one carnal, the other spiritual—the one human and earthly, the other heavenly and divine. The natural system is peculiarly unsteady, showy, and, according to its manifestations, endlessly diversified—ranging from the lowest forms of heathenism, upward through successive stages, to the most refined and subtle forms of heresy, or religious delusion, which come to us in the name of religion and of a higher spiritual Christianity. All such natural religion, starting, though it may be, in the spirit, ends universally in the flesh. Destitute of principle, it is ever shifting its ground; and yet, in all its changes and endless transformations, it remains essentially true to itself. It is based on Nature and on natural capacities; and is in consequence, selfish, proud, boastful, presumptuous, and full of hypocrisy—the religion of the Scribes and Pharisees! The other system is less versatile, showy, and ambitious; it is humble and meek, and exceedingly diffident, and submissive to the authority of Jesus Christ; but, for this very reason also, it is

infinitely more consistent, real, and substantial. It has no confidence in the flesh; but steadily hopes in the living God. It is confiding, calm, and rational—leaning with sweet composure upon the gracious provisions of the everlasting covenant. It is essentially a *system of grace*, whose main feature is "faith"; whose hope consists in this, that the foundation of God standeth sure, having this double seal: "The Lord knoweth them that are His;" and, "Let every one, that nameth the name of Christ, depart from iniquity."

This covenant system necessarily presupposes, for its full and complete success, certain educational processes or religious instruction. That the idea of God's kingdom or general plan of redemption includes that of spiritual training also, cannot, it seems to us, escape the notice of even the most casual observer. It lies in the very nature of that kingdom, as a nursery of piety and school of the Spirit, that it should include in its system of operation such disciplinary processes as our view of the subject assumes. Without stopping to fortify this position, by special and extended citations from the sacred Scriptures, it will be sufficent to adduce only this one explicit and strong testimony of Jesus Christ himself, in His grand intercessory prayer: "This is life eternal, that they might know Thee, the only true God and Jesus Christ whom Thou has sent."

This language, it seems to us, is decisive of the point. The idea brought to view here, evidently is; The essential connection between the knowledge of God, in Christ, and eternal life; and, as the *cultivation* of this divine knowledge requires a corresponding series of divine institutions, ordinances, and means of grace,—so the entire system may be appropriately termed the Divine Method, or *Gospel Educational System*, in distinction from the merely *natural and impulsive.*

By the term, Gospel Educational System, is meant that peculiar style of Christianity or system of religion, which seeks the cultivation of piety and virtue by means of faithful religious instruction or the inculcation of truth—that

system, which, discarding all confidence in the flesh and in human contrivances generally, plants itself upon the "everlasting covenant;" and, seeking its first glimmerings of hope, as well as all succeeding divine communications, "through the mercy of God unto eternal life," *only* and exclusively in this covenant state, builds up itself and its subjects in "the nurture and admonition of the Lord"—not by occasional spasmodic efforts, but by a diligent use of the ordinary means of grace, established in the Church, according to that beautiful saying of St. Jude: "Ye, beloved, building up yourselves on your most holy faith, praying in the Holy Ghost, keep yourselves in the love of God, looking for the mercy of our Lord Jesus Christ, unto eternal life."

This is a general outline of the Gospel system, necessarily assuming and cheerfully acknowledging an essential connection between the knowledge of God in Christ, and eternal life; and it will be the object of this paper, first, distinctly to define and illustrate this educational system, then briefly to review the history of it as furnished in the sacred Scriptures, and, finally, to point out some pertinent reasons for its continued observance on the part of the Church.

It has been already assumed, that, without the knowledge of God in Christ, there can be no genuine religion; but this implies also, that, where there is such an experimental knowledge of the mystery of "God manifest in the flesh," we actually do "have eternal life." The connection between the two things is not accidental, but necessary and essential. The one conditions the other, and constitutes its only and absolutely indispensable basis. That such a knowledge of God *is* "eternal life," appears clearly from the fact, that it is possible only to the "new creation in Christ"—to such as are in the covenant, and share the illumination of the Holy Ghost. In the deepest and truest sense of the term, can no man "call Jesus Lord except by the Holy Ghost." Hence the great mass of the fleshly-minded Jews rejected Christ, "but as many as received

Him, to them gave He power to become the sons of God, even to as many as believed on His name: which were born, not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God." How this object is effected, and by what means men are introduced into this blessed state, we are informed in the Saviour's address to Nicodemus: "Verily, verily, I say unto thee, except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God. That which is born of the flesh—naturally—is flesh; and that which is born of the Spirit—according to God's appointment—is Spirit. Marvel not that I said unto you, ye must be born again." Paul, as already intimated, positively asserts that "no man can call Jesus Lord except by the Holy Ghost." So intimate and vital is the relation between the knowledge of God in Christ, and the illumination of the Holy Ghost, that they cannot be separated; and yet the saving gifts of the Spirit are promised only to the children of the covenant. When the penitent Jews said unto Peter and to the rest of the apostles: "Men and brethren, what shall we do? Peter answered and said unto them: Repent, and be baptized every one of you—old and young—in the name of Jesus Christ, for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost; for the promise is unto you, and to your children, and to all that are afar off, even as many as the Lord our God shall call." Such was the apostolic assurance, given to the inquiring Jews, on condition of hearty repentance for sin and believing submission to the ordinance of salvation—baptism in the name of Jesus Christ. The word of promise was confidently spoken; the assurance of pardon and divine illumination given, and the penitent inquirers invited to avail themselves of the proffered mercy by submitting to the proposed condition. "Then they, that gladly received his word, were baptized; and the same day there were added unto them about three thousand souls." Now, in the communion of the Church—"the pillar and ground of the truth"—they found the desired rest, that rest which the world can neither give nor take away. In

short, they found here an abiding, cheering, satisfying home for their spirits. Hence, "they continued stedfastly in the Apostles' doctrine and fellowship, and of breaking of bread, and in prayers."

See how absolutely one thing is made to hang upon another. The preached word—full of divine power, and of subduing, saving, sanctifying influence—had its effect. Sin, in all its deformity, stood out to the view of the offenders. They quailed under its condemning power. Conviction was followed by inquiry—sincere, earnest inquiry—after salvation; and this by an Apostolic injunction to repentance and baptism, in the name of Jesus Christ, for the remission of sins and the receiving of the gifts of the Holy Ghost. The truly penitent complied with this injunction, and so obtained assurance of the Apostles' doctrine, access to their blessed fellowship, participation in the sacrament of the altar, and an interest in the public prayers; and, what is more than all, they enjoyed in this covenant state the grace of perseverance, so that they "continued steadfastly" *in* the same, and thus obtained assurance of what John says, "that whatsoever is born of God overcometh the world."

Hence we see the necessity of implicit faith in the doctrines of Christ, submission to the order of salvation, and an abiding union and communion with the Redeemer's person and kingdom. When He taught His disciples the necessity of a real participation in his mediatorial life—His person and doctrine—His sufferings, death, resurrection, and ascension to the right hand of God, and His continued intercession with the Father,—when He said: "Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of Man and drink His blood, ye have no life in you,"—many of His disciples, stumbling at the strange and bold declaration, said: "This is an hard saying, who can hear it?" But, "when Jesus knew in Himself that His disciples murmured at it, He said unto them: doth this offend you?" and immediately proceeded to propound still greater mysteries, even the exaltation of His human person—"the Son of Man"—to the right hand of

God, and the necessity of a divine influence—a power from on high—to enable any one even to come unto Him. This gave still greater offence, as it effectually checked the pride of the natural heart, and pointed to an *order of grace*, as the only ground on which to hope for an interest in His atonement. "From that time many of His disciples," we are told, "went back and walked no more with Him." The outward and superficial connection, which they had formed with their Lord, could not bear these strong and far-reaching requirements. The seed of the divine word had not taken sufficient root in them. They were but "way-side" hearers, and consequently unsettled. "Then said Jesus unto the twelve: will ye also go away?" The time-servers, who have been but slightly moved by the power of the truth, and have never experienced its regenerating power, —*these* have left me: will *ye* also leave me? "Then Simon Peter answered Him, Lord, to whom shall we go? Thou hast the words of eternal life, and we believe, and are sure, that Thou art that Christ, the Son of the living God?"

Now observe here again the order of events, and the mutual dependence of the several facts stated. Jesus taught the disciples the "mysteries of the kingdom of Heaven." Some took offence, and said: "this is a hard saying." Jesus does not recall or in any way soften his words. He rather insists on all He had said, and more besides, as necessary to salvation. Many of His disciples forsake Him. He turns to the twelve chosen ones, who had enjoyed not only His public preaching, but also His more private and particular instructions, in reference to the mysteries of the kingdom of God, to know which it was given to them *only*, and not to such as were "without." What was the effect which this private and more familiar and specific instruction, in the mysteries of religion, had on the twelve? Had the truth found its way to their hearts and there laid the foundation of a permanent adherence to Christ and His cause? When Jesus said, "will ye also go away?" one, in the name and behalf of himself and the rest, answered:

"Lord, to whom shall we go? Thou hast the words of eternal life; and we believe, and are sure, that Thou art that Christ—the Son of the living God." Here is an outcoming of the life of faith. Evidently, they were so bound up with and attached to Christ, that they could not even think of leaving Him; and the reason of it was, that He had "the words of eternal life"—words which not only *manifested*, but also really possessed and communicated eternal life; and, in consequence of this, they believed and were sure that He was that Christ—"the Son of the living God"—"the Hope of Israel" and "the desire of all nations."

Here we have, at once, the efflorescence and fruit of that unwearied care, and special instruction in the "mysteries of the kingdom of Heaven," which the Saviour had bestowed upon His own highly-favored disciples. He was Himself the Great "Sower" who "went forth to sow." Some seeds in the very nature of things, passed over and beyond the cultivated beds in the garden of the Lord, and so fell by the way-side, where, unburied and exposed, they were either trodden under foot of men or devoured by the fowls of the air. Others again fell, indeed, inside of the sacred enclosure, and upon cultivated ground, but on a subsoil rock, which, for want of soil and moisture, effectually prevented their growth unto perfection. Others, again, falling also within the sacred enclosure and there sprouting were afterwards choked, and rendered unproductive, by the "thorns and briers" which sprung up from the remaining roots of bitterness—the unsubdued lusts—that still lurked in the rich soil. In these several ways much of the seed was lost; yet "others fell on good ground," and sprung up. and produced an abundant harvest, of which these chosen twelve were the most eminent "first fruits."

The efficient means or instrumental cause of this regenerating process was the word of Christ,—or those "words of eternal life," whose divine power and energy the Apostles had so nobly confessed. Hence also all Christians

universally are represented as "being born again" by a supernatural power—"not of corruptible seed, but of incorruptible, even the word of God, which liveth and abideth for ever!" And Paul, speaking of this "mystery among the Gentiles," which is Christ in them the "hope of glory," very significantly says: "Whom we preach, warning every man, and teaching every man in all wisdom, that we may present every man perfect in Christ Jesus." And to Timothy he says, "take heed unto thyself, and unto the doctrine; continue in them: for, in doing this, thou shalt both save thyself and them that hear thee."

These references are sufficient to show that "faith comes by hearing, and hearing by the word of God"—that men are to be saved by a "manifestation of the truth"—that it has "pleased God by the foolishness of preaching to save them that believe." Hence our adorable Lord appropriately said unto the Jews: "Search the Scriptures, for in them ye think ye have eternal life; and they are they which testify of me." And, in His grand intercessory prayer to His Father, He says: "Sanctify them by Thy truth; Thy word is truth." It must be evident to all that there is an essential connection between the knowledge of God in Christ, and eternal life, and that the great object of the ministry, therefore, should be to make known, in their daily ministrations "the unsearchable riches of Christ"—faithfully to "preach the word; to be instant in season and out of season; to reprove, rebuke, exhort, with long-suffering and doctrine"—in short, to "make disciples of all nations, by baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost," and then "TEACHING them to observe all things whatsoever Christ Himself has commanded"—diligently training these plants of righteousness for heaven and eternal life. Such is evidently the great end and purpose of the Christian ministry, and such its relation to men and their salvation. Hence Paul magnifies his office and claims special honor for the ambassadors of heaven. He desires that men "should so account of us as of the ministers of Christ, and stewards of the mysteries of God."

Such substantially is *the nature* of this Gospel Educational Scheme. Let us endeavor briefly to *review its history*, as furnished in the sacred Scriptures. The system presupposes *discipleship*, or separation from the world and a sacramental incorporation with the kingdom of God. It is not in the order of nature, but of grace, that this divine system holds. It has no confidence in the flesh, and trusts not in "bodily exercises" or human devices. Under it men are to be spiritually trained—brought up in "the nurture and admonition of the Lord."

This spiritual training we find amply provided for in the orginal covenant made with the "father of the faithful." The Lord appeared unto Abraham, and said: "I will establish my covenant between me and thee, and thy seed after thee, in their generations, for an everlasting covenant, to be a God unto thee and thy seed after thee." The peculiarities of this covenant consist in its freeness or sovereignty —its permanence—universality—and exclusiveness. It is a gracious covenant, because it was not only wholly *unmerited*, but even unsolicited: God appeared unto Abraham and proposed its establishment. It is permanent and abiding, inasmuch as it is an "everlasting covenant, in all things well ordered and sure." It is universal, because it includes all the posterity of Abraham, naturally and spiritually also, "all that are afar off, even as many as the Lord our God shall call," the Gentiles! It was made with him, and with his seed after him, in their generations. And, finally, it is exclusive, in that it guarantees its rich gifts and immunities to its own particular subjects alone. Aliens and strangers could lay no claim to these divine blessings. All that remained outside of the covenant, were, by virtue of their very position, excluded from the people of God and His covenant mercies, so far, at least, as they came externally within its reach and yet refused to embrace its gracious provisions in penitence and faith and by an unconditional submission to the order of grace. So much for the covenant itself and its esssential peculiarities. Now FIDELITY to this covenant and its provisions constituted for

the ancients the only sure guaranty of the divine favor and of a saving knowledge of the truth. On this ground only did God make known to them the counsels of His will. So, in Gen. 18: 17–19, the Lord said: "Shall I hide from Abraham that thing which I do; seeing that Abraham shall surely become a great and mighty nation, and all the nations of the earth shall be blessed in him? for I know him, that he will command his children and his household after him, and they shall keep the way of the Lord, to do justice and judgment; that the Lord may bring upon Abraham that which He hath spoken of him." This corresponds with what David said—that "the secret of the Lord is with them that fear him," and that "He will show them His covenant;" or, in other words, that He will make known to them the counsels of His will, and "fulfill all their desires."

This whole covenant system was re-affirmed, and formally established in the Mosaic Law. When God had solemnly confirmed His covenant with Israel, through the mediation of His servant Moses, the stern law-giver earnestly entreated them to remain faithful to this blessed relation, saying: "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thine heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy might. And these words, which I command thee this day, shall be in thine heart; and thou shalt teach them diligently unto thy children, and shalt talk of them when thou sittest in thine house, and when thou walkest by the way, and when thou liest down, and when thou risest up. And thou shalt bind them for a sign upon thine hand, and they shall be as frontlets between thine eyes. And thou shalt write them upon the posts of thine house and on thy gates." In this diversified form of speech, so earnest and moving, does Moses entreat the church of his day to "keep the word of God," and diligently to teach its blessed doctrines to her children. And upon the faithful observance of these commands he suspends their prosperity both as a nation and a church. On this ground only was it to be well with them and their children after them, and they were to go

in and possess the land which the Lord, had promised unto their fathers. In remaining faithful to the covenant they have the assurance of great spiritual prosperity, and of very peculiar favors from God, who says: "I will pour water upon him that is thirsty, and floods upon the dry ground: I will pour my Spirit upon thy seed, and my blessing upon thine offspring: and they shall spring up as among grass—as willows by the water courses. One shall say: I am the Lord's; and another shall call himself by the name of Jacob; and another shall subscribe with his hand unto the Lord, and surname himself by the name of Israel." In these touchingly beautiful words the prophet delineates the cheerful piety of the young—the children of pious and faithful parents—impatiently pressing into the kingdom of God, and offering themselves as "living sacrifices" upon His holy altar. And such undoubtedly would *always* be the case, if only parents could be brought to see clearly, and earnestly to perform, their solemn obligations to God and their children. But too often they betray their solemn trust, practically despise the covenant of God, and readily fall in with every popular movement that may assume the task of making conversions "by might and by power," instead of expecting the salvation of themselves and their children by the silent operations of the Spirit of God in the use of the ordinary means of grace established in the Church. How exceedingly common, now-a-days, is such apostacy from the divine covenant and its gracious provisions; and how terribly true is it, that the iniquity of such parents as exchange the divine order of grace for human fancies and "bodily exercises," is visited upon their "children to the third and fourth generation" even—until, not unfrequently, we see entire communities, once flourishing as the garden of the Lord, reduced to a barren waste, where not a solitary flower is seen to bloom or breathe its sweet fragrance in devotion to the skies. As far out as the eye can reach all is desolate and bleak, unless the dull monotony broken by the occasional appearance of some deluded victim, who, though now par-

tially awakened from his dreams, sees his error when too late to avoid the terrible cataract which threatens to sweep him away in its resistless course. Far different is it with such as have embarked in the ship of Christ—the ark of salvation! She rides triumphant on the storm-tossed bosom of life's rough sea; and both herself and her precious treasures are safe, because Jesus, the eternal Son of God, is in her midst. Her trust is in the living God; and "the Highest Himself shall establish her." Every foe is destined to perish. "All her children also shall be taught of the Lord; and great shall be the peace of her children." Her ministry *now*, as ever, is a ministry of life, light, and love. So was it formerly in the case of Levi of whom God says: "My covenant was with him of life and of peace; and I gave them to him for the fear wherewith he feared me, and was afraid before my name. The law of truth was in his mouth, and iniquity was not found in his lips: he walked with me in peace and equity, and did turn many away from iniquity: for the priest's lips should keep knowledge, and they should seek the law at his mouth; for he is the messenger of the Lord of Hosts."

Such is the Old Testament view of this subject. All is suspended on the "everlasting covenant." This brought men into new and peculiar relations to God. It secured them His favor and benediction, and afforded grounds of "faith, hope, and charity:" in a word, it transferred men from a state of nature to a state of grace, and thus opened the way for special religious culture—the spiritual training of men for the kingdom of Heaven. And how is it in the New Testament? Here we find the old system not only fully sanctioned in all its essential features, relations, and parts, but likwise permanently established and brought to perfection. "Think not that I am come to destroy the law and the prophets," says Christ, "I am not come to destroy, but to fulfill"—that is, to fill up and bring to perfection that which before existed only in outline. Jesus Christ, during His own personal ministry, not only preached the gosel publicly, but also taught, in a private and

more familiar way, His own disciples, because unto them it was "given to know the mysteries of the kingdom of heaven." He clearly recognized also the peculiar provisions of the ancient covenant, which guaranteed salvation equally to believing parents and their children. "Suffer the little children to come unto me and forbid them not," said He, "for of such is the kingdom of God: and He took them up in His arms, put His hands upon them, and blessed them." When, on a subsequent occasion, He saw the generous-hearted Zaccheus on the Sycamore tree, He said unto him: "Make haste, and come down; for to-day I must abide at thy house; and he made haste, and came down, and received Him joyfully:" and in spite of the murmurs of the Pharisees, Jesus said unto Him: "this day is salvation come to this house, for as much as he also is a son or Abraham"—the divine blessing thus descending upon distant generations!

After these preliminary observations, it is hoped, we shall be able, in some measure at least, to appreciate the nature and extent of the last great commission, which, shortly before His ascension, Christ gave to His apostles. This commission, which we have treated in a special article, requires some further notice in this place; for, in all our inquiries respecting the nature of the Christian ministry and of the Christian system generally, it must be taken as our absolute and indispensable rule or name. Only in the light of this grand chart is it possible for us to understand fully the system of the gospel. What then is the nature and import of this commission? It is couched in these remarkable words: "All power is given unto me in heaven and on earth: go ye, therefore, and teach—disciple—all nations, (by) baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost; teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you: and, lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world." Here we have three things: *first*, a claim, on the part of Jesus, to universal power and dominion; *secondly*, a commission given to the apostles and their successors forever, empowering them to go and disciple all nations,

or, as Mark has it, to evangelize every creature; and, *thirdly*, a promise of Christ's gracious presence to the end of time, assuring them of success in their arduous and responsible work. And what are the terms of this commission so far as it relates to the nature of the Christian ministry and the course to be pursued by those in office in preparing men for the life to come?

It is said: "Go ye, therefore, and disciple all nations, by baptizing them," etc. An exact parallel this to the provisions of the old covenant. According to the Scriptures, the first step in the order of salvation is to bring men into the covenant. Outside of this all is under the curse—hopelessly involved in the sin of our first parents. Here all is dark and cheerless. Death reigns triumphant in the world. The only refuge is Jesus Christ, the righteous. This is what Paul means, when he says: "The Scripture hath concluded all under sin, that the promise by faith of Jesus Christ might be given to them that believe." Nothing is left to man himself. All centres in Christ. "Know ye, therefore, that they which be of faith, the same are the children of Abraham, and heirs according to the promise" —even as the everlasting covenant was before confirmed of God in Christ. And, now, as the children of the covenant, in the Old Testament economy, were to be diligently trained, and instructed in the doctrines of salvation, so too our blessed Redeemer enjoins it upon His apostles, and they again upon their successors, to bring up the children of the covenant in the "nurture and admonition of the Lord;" or, as the Redeemer Himself ordains, "the stewards of the mysteries of God" were carefully to train, for usefulness and happiness, those whom they had constituted disciples, "teaching them to observe" the commands of their Lord and Master: and only in so doing, had they the promise of His gracious presence and blessing.

The apostles evidently so understood their high commission, and acted accordingly. Look at the first grand display of divine power in connection with the preaching of the gospel. When, on the day of Pentecost, the peni-

tent Jews asked: "Men and brethren, what shall we do?" Peter answered—"Repent, and be baptized, every one of you, in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost." Here is the divine requisition. "Then they that gladly received his word were baptized," and so brought into the church and covenant of God, and entitled to its blessings and privileges. Here they felt at home; and consequently "they continued steadfastly in the apostles' doctrine and fellowship, and in breaking of bread, and in prayers." Here is a regular system of truth, which lay at the bottom of all that follows—the communion of the saints—the "breaking of bread," or Sacrament of Christ's body and blood—and prayers," or the united worship of God's house. This system of truth, or apostolic doctrine is elsewhere called "the faith"—i. e., the universally received system of truth or doctrine, containing and exhibiting the faith of God's elect—the apostolic doctrinal formula—that "most holy faith" which according to St. Jude, "was once delived to the Saints," and for which all were commanded "earnestly to contend."

This system of faith consisted of connected series of religious truths, very much as we now have it in the Apostles' Creed, whose general outlines, only in a reversed order, are found in Paul's Epistle to the Ephesians. Chap. 4: 1–6. This universal faith of the church is that "form of sound words" which the youthful Timothy was to "hold fast," as having received it of Paul, the aged, in "faith" and love, which is in Christ Jesus." Into this "most holy faith" all converts were baptized, and exhorted to be "established" in the same, "even as they had been taught, abounding therein with thanksgiving." Col. 2: 7. Here again the most careful religious instruction is presupposed. This systematic instruction in the Christian faith, was, in its simplest form, usually styled "catechising," and consisted in a brief, simple, and comprehensive statement of Christian doctrine, generally in the way of question and answer—based on the history of Christ, especially his in-

carnation, life of obedience, death, resurrection, and ascension to the right hand of God, "where He ever liveth to make intercession for the Saints according to the will of God."

For the evidence of these statements we refer to the beginning of St. Luke's gospel, where he gives as a reason for "setting forth in order" the facts of the gospel history or a "declaration of those things which are most surely believed," that he wishes his beloved Theopholus to "know the *certainty* of those things wherein he had been instructed" or catechised (*κατηχήθης*) as it is in the original. The idea is that he wishes to give, in a condensed form, the history of our redemption, which history constitutes the basis of the church's "faith"—the system of doctrine "once delivered to the saints," and by them handed down from generation to generation, until it was gradually embodied in what is now popularly called the Apostles' Creed. That such elementary instruction or catechisation was current in the Church, during the Apostolic period, is evident from the frequent recurrence of such expressions as the "faith"—"the words of faith and of knowledge"—"the form of sound words"—and, generally, the "faith," which Christians are said to "have been taught," and others of like import. It is equally clear that this system of religious instruction was substantially the same as that which is involved in the conception of the original covenant with Abraham, and the practice of which by him was so highly commended of God,—the same as that which was subsequently incorporated in the Mosaic Laws and institutions. All this is clear from a comparison of what Paul says in Rom. 2: 18, and Gal. 6: 6. In the former passage he represents a Jew as "being instructed" or catechised "out of the law" (*κατηχούμενος ἐκ τοῦ νόμου*) as the Greek has it. In the latter passage, Paul say: "Let him that is taught (literally catechised—*κατηχούμενος*) in the word, communicate unto him that teacheth *τῷ κατηχοῦντι*—(catechises—the catechist) in all good things." From this place it is evident that catechisation or the familiar instruc-

tion of the young and unexperienced was a prominent feature in the pastoral work of the Apostolic period. And this excellent custom, as we learn from history, was continued in the Church afterwards, and has always been regarded by the great mass of professing Christians as the only sure guarantee of a *sound faith*, and of a pure, rational, and consistent practical Christianity.

Hence this System—Gospel Educational System—has been very generally esteemed and practiced by the great and good of all ages and countries. The early Church made immense account of it; established schools for the special training of catechists; and thus supplied the Church with a multitude of competent, practical, and efficient teachers. Luther, as we had occasion to observe in our article on the great commission, exercised himself very extensively in the composition of Catechisms for the use of children and youth. Melancthon added the most brilliant star to his crown by composing the Augsburg Confession. Zwingli and his coadjutors provided the Swiss Churches with a formulary, or rather formularies, of the faith; and Calvin, the master spirit of the age, concentrated all his mighty energies upon this important point, and plucked his sweetest and most fragrant flowers in this delightful field of pastoral activity. Last, but not least, on the soil of continental Europe, we have Ursinus and Olevianus engaged in composing our own inimitable symbol—the Heidelberg Catechism. And later still, though in part also earlier, we see the English and Scotch Churches coming up to this good work, and laying upon the altar, in complete form, the "Thirty Nine Articles," and the "Westminster Confession," as an enduring monument of their faith and love, and as an evidence of their affectionate sympathy with the Church Catholic in this particular department of Christian discipline. How beautiful and touching the thought, that, in this respect at least, the Church was of one heart and of one mind—that in this one particular point, the universal pulse of the Christian Church beat in harmony, and thus gave some faint intima-

tion prophetically of that blessed state of the Christian world, when all the genuine disciples of the crucified One shall see eye to eye, and work hand in hand, coöperating with perfect unanimity in building up the kingdom of Christ and in rearing a spiritual temple to the honor of their divine Lord and Redeemer!

Having, to some extent, defined and illustrated the subject under review—traced the history of the Gospel Educational System as furnished in the sacred Scriptures and corroborated by the history of the Church,—and having, in the course of our remarks, shown the relation subsisting between the knowledge of God in Christ and eternal life, and the consequent necessity for spiritual training or specific religious instruction, we shall yet, in conclusion, point out a few of the most pertinent reasons for continuing in the belief and practice of this ancient and venerable system.

We may begin by asserting that this system has the highest possible sanctions. It was originally appointed by the Lord Himself, for the use of His Church, and by her perpetuated from generation to generation. The conscientious practice of this system was commenced by Abraham, "the father of the faithful." It laid the foundation of his subsequent greatness and prosperity, spiritual and temporal. "For I know him," says God, "that he will command his children, and his household after him, and they shall keep the way of the Lord, and do justice and judgment; that the Lord may bring upon Abraham that which He hath spoken of him." It was made an integral part of the Mosaic systems and thus served to exert a mighty, far-reaching, and controling influence on the destiny of nations, and of generations to come, down to the end of time. It was also fully and expressly sanctioned by our Lord, and incorporated in the system of the Gospel. It was solemnly enjoined upon the Apostles, in their high commission, as we have seen, and by them faithfully practiced during their personal ministry. It was fondly cherished, maintained, and perpetuated by the early Church. It has

come down even to us, by regular succession, as the dearest inheritance of the Church. It bears accordingly, the seal of God's own most perfect approval, not only by being his own special appointment at first, but also by being amply attested in the experience of a long line of martyrs and confessors, who lived and died in the love and defense of this system. This noble army of saints furnish, by their heroic faith, dauntless courage, and unexampled sufferings in the cause of truth and righteousness, the most convincing evidence of the divine power and excellence of the religion of Christ, especially in that peculiar form which constituted the basis of their spiritual training.

This ancient system also has "exceeding great and precious promises." It holds out the highest encouragement to parents, pastors, and teachers. It speaks with confidence of the final results of all properly conducted educational efforts. It says, "Train up a child in the way he should go, and, when he is old, he will not depart from it." This beautiful apothem has found many a blessed fulfillment in the history and experience of the Church. All the promises of God have been tested, and found to be really "yea and amen." Jesus Christ Himself conformed to this system, and was blessed in the deed. In infancy already, His pious and devoted parents presented Him to God according to the provisions of the ancient covenant; and in connection with this fact, it is significantly said: "the child grew, and waxed strong in spirit, filled with wisdom, and the grace of God was upon Him." Such was the infancy or childhood of Jesus—perfectly natural, and, in all respects, conformed to the common order of human life. When twelve years of age, His parents took Him along to Jerusalem to attend one of the grand national festivals. Unaffected by the external splendor of the holy city and of the temple, and wholly occupied with the thoughts of the spirit world, He found His chief delight in sitting at the feet of the wise and learned, in the courts of the temple, where His parents subsequently found Him, "sitting in the midst af the doctors, both hearing them,

and asking them questions;" and all this with special reference, no doubt, to His entrance into the congregation of Israel, as the custom *always* was for children, when twelve years of age or in their thirteenth year, thus passing over from being "children of the covenant" simply, to being also "children of the congregation" or "sons of the Law." Here again the youthful Saviour, just as before and afterwards, "fulfilled all righteousness," or, in other words, conformed cheerfully to the customs of His people and the requirements of the Law. And it is *remarkable* that here again the sacred record says: "Jesus increased in wisdom and stature, and in favor with God and man."

When Jesus Christ commissioned His apostles to go into all the world, and preach His gospel to every creature, or, according to Matthew, to make disciples of all nations, by baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, teaching them to observe all things whatsoever He had commanded them, He added: "Lo, I am with you alway even unto the end of the world." Now the meaning and force of such a promise of the divine presence *always* is, as might easily be shown, that God gives success to the cause of the person with whom He promises to be; and this promise of Christ, taken in this sense, was abundantly verified in the mighty achievements and wonderful success of the apostles and their successors in office. They were permitted to preach the gospel and administer its sealing ordinances with much joy and assurance, "God also bearing them witness, both with signs and wonders, and with divers miracles, and gifts of the Holy Ghost, according to His own will." Under the divine guidance and benediction they turned many to righteousness, and led to the feet of Jesus multitudes who were afterwards to shine as "stars in the crown of their rejoicing."

Again, this system makes due account of the established means of grace, the scriptural and permanent provisions for the spiritual birth, growth, and perfection of God's children. It equally esteems both word and sacrament.

The penitent sinner, who has been "quickened" by the "word of God which liveth and abideth for ever," is tenderly received, and, "by the washing of regeneration, and renewing of the Holy Ghost," is incorporated in the kingdom of God—the body mystical of Christ—that so, being "planted in the house of the Lord," he may "flourish in the courts of our God." But *how* are we thus spiritually advanced? We answer by the application of purely divine and supernatural means. As men are not, in the first instance, brought into the Church by "might or by power," but by the "Spirit of the Lord," so *now*, when in the house, they are not fed and nourished with "common" bread, but with that "bread of God, which cometh down from heaven, and giveth life unto the world." Jesus Christ says: "I am the living bread which cometh down from heaven. If any man eat of this bread he shall live forever; and the bread that I will give is my flesh, which I will give for the life of the world." Here a new leaf opens in the life of the Saint. The "new creature in Christ" must be sustained and perfected. This requires new bread, spiritual aliment, or "living bread," the eating of which is made an indispensable condition of spiritual and eternal life, and of its maintenance "unto the resurrection of the just." Jesus Himself is said to be "our life," to be "formed in us the hope of glory; and accordingly our life is said to be "hid with Christ in God." So the Holy Ghost, the accomplisher in us of the work of redemption, is said to "take of the things of Christ and show them unto us"—to bind us up with Him in a blessed fellowship—that "*so* we, being many, are one body in Christ, and members one of another," even as we "have been all made to drink into our spirit." Only in this mystical life-union with Christ can we enjoy the gifts of the Holy Ghost—the grace of life—and thereby grow, and be "changed into the same image with Him, from glory to glory, even as by the Spirit of the Lord."

To see how immensely important to our spiritual growth, and so to our final salvation, is a proper knowledge and

appreciation of the holy sacraments, in connection with the word, we need only recall the solemn and thrillingly interesting declaration of our Lord, in John, where He so emphatically says: "Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of Man, and drink His blood, ye have no life in you. Whoso eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, hath eternal life; and I will raise him up at the last day. For my flesh is meat indeed, and my blood is drink indeed. He that eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood, dwelleth in me, and I in him." This is the essential requisite of eternal life. Now, we ask, is there any provision made in God's house for this mystical eating and drinking of Christ's body and blood? Most assuredly there is. This strong language, we assert, finds an echo in the institution of the Holy Supper—the sacrament of the altar. "Take, eat," says Christ, "this is my body;" and he took the cup, saying: "Drink ye all of it; this cup is the new testament in my blood, which is shed for you." And Paul says: "the cup of blessing, which we bless, is it not the communion of the blood of Christ? The bread which we break, is it not the communion of the body of Christ? For we, being many, are one bread, and one body; for we are all partakers of that one bread"—i. e., of Christ! So perfectly interlinked are these several means of grace—word and sacrament—which the Holy Ghost employs in our regeneration, conversion, sanctification, and redemption or final glorification, that they can not be separated; and the system of the Church, accordingly, keeps them united, and equally esteems both; does not exalt one at the expense of the other: nor does it continually harp on conversion, only, but seeks also the "edifying of the body of Christ; till we all come, in the unity of the faith, and of the knowledge of the Son of God, unto a perfect man—unto the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ."

Finally, this system has been, as already shown, successfuly employed, and its extraordinary virtues fairly tested. As a system of divine appointment, and accompained with assurances of the divine favor and benediction,

we might reasonably conclude that it would prove itself highly efficient. It is, in fact, the only system which effectually checks the pride of the human heart, and arises up a standard against the power and influence of Pelagianism. It effectually vindicates the Scriptural view of human depravity and spiritual impotence, by absolutely denying to the "old man" the power of performing "good works." It looks for the possibility of salvation away from nature, and all natural contrivances, to an "order of grace" in the church. It has full faith in the ordinances of God, and in the efficacy of His word. It hesitates not, with Jesus Christ, to say: "Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God." And with Ananias, the good bishop of Damascus, it confidently points the weeping penitent to the ordinance of heaven, saying: "Why tarriest thou? Arise, and be baptized, and wash away thy sins, calling on the name of the Lord." It looks, for the very first step in the way of genuine repentance and evangelical faith, not to "bodily exercises," and human contrivances, but to the mercy of God in Christ, who saves us "by the washing of regeneration, and renewing of the Holy Ghost"—that, "being justified by His grace, we should be made heirs according to the hope of eternal life." It seeks for guarantied security only in the *church*, the antitype of Noah's ark, wherein comparitively few, it is said, were "saved by water" from the general wreck—the perishing world—"the like figure whereunto even baptism doth also now save us, not the putting away of the filth of the flesh, but the answer (stipulation) of a good conscience toward God, by the resurrection of Jesus Christ." Only in this way of divine appointment do we acquire "boldness to enter into the holiest, by the blood of Jesus—having our hearts sprinkled from an evil conscience, and our bodies washed with pure water."

In the progress of this blessed work—the work of conversion, sanctification, and redemption—the same divine excellence and superiority of the Gospel Education-

al system over that which is merely natural and impulsive —spiritualized naturalism—are everywhere apparent.— This system firmly holds that no vile person "shall inherit the kingdom of God," and that, because "we all are by nature the children of wrath," it must be said of us, as it was of the Corinthians: "Such *were* some of you; but ye are washed, ye are sanctified, ye are justified, in the name of the Lord Jesus, and by the Spirit of our God." Hence it is appropriately said, that "Christ also loved the church, and gave Himself for it; that He might sanctify and cleanse it with the washing of water by the word; that He might present it to Himself a glorious church, not having spot, or wrinkle, or any such thing; but that it should be holy and without blemish." Here again the word of God comes prominently into view, as an essential element in the work of salvation. We have already seen that Peter calls it "the incorruptible seed" by whose divine power and energy we are "born again." The Holy Ghost never works independently of this blessed word. It is accordingly called the "word of life," and the "gospel of our salvation," in the use of which we are "quickened" by the Spirit of God, and by Him also "sealed unto the day of redemption." Hence it is said in reference to the word of salvation which was preached and expounded to the soul-stricken Cornelius and "those with him, that, while Peter yet spake these works, the Holy Ghost fell on all them that heard the WORD."

It was no doubt in reference to this overwhelming power of the divine word, and its relation to man's redemption, that, on an earlier occasion, the same Peter said unto Jesus: "Thou hast the words of eternal life; and we believe, and are sure, that Thou art that Christ, the Son of the living God." Such a full and complete assurance of faith could come only from the implanted word or "words of eternal life" which Jesus spake. These words, accompanied by divine energy and influence, burned into the very substance of the spirit, and became incarnate there—enshrined in the soul as an element of eternal life, quickening, ele-

vating, and transforming the whole inner man into the divine image. Such is the power of the Gospel; and it was doubtless owing to this importance of the word of God, that, in His promise of another comforter—the Holy Ghost—the Redeemer assures His disciples, that, when He, the Spirit of truth, was come, He should guide them into all truth, and bring to their remembrance all things whatsoever He Himself had taught them. And the noble, pure, and generous-hearted Paul exclaims: "God forbid that I should glory, save in the cross of our Lord Jesus Christ;" and, in a different connection, he says: "I am not ashamed of the gospel of Christ; for it is the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth—to the Jew first, and also to the Gentile."

From the general tenor of our discussion, as well as from the particular remarks, which, in its progress, have been made, we can infer the true nature and purpose of that system of grace which God has established for the salvation of men. The ambassadors of God are commissioned and sent forth, to make known to a dying world "the unsearchable riches of Christ"—in other words, to preach "Jesus Christ and Him crucified," and, in His name, to propose terms of reconciliation. To those who penitently ask, "men and brethren, what shall we do?" they answer: "Repent, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost; for the promise is to you, and to your children, and to all that are afar off, even as many as the Lord our God shall call." Here is perfect order. Penitence, anxious inquiries after salvation, Apostolic injunctions, terms, and promises, all follow each other in quick and necessary succession—mutually limiting and conditioning each other, and all looking forward, through penitence and pardon, to the bestowment of the permanent gift of the spirit, in connection with Baptism in the name of Jesus Christ. This "washing of regeneration, and renewing of the Holy Ghost" secures to the penitent believer "an unction from the Holy One," and puts him

in a position, in which he is enabled, to "know all things" necessary to salvation—i. e., accurately to discriminate between what is morally good and morally evil.

Such experimental, spiritual, divine knowledge makes men humble, and willing to sit, with Mary, at the Saviour's feet to hear "the words of eternal life;" or to roam joyfully over the garden of the Lord, gathering flowers of sweetest fragrance and richest hue, to be woven into a garland of beauty for the Redeemer's brow; and, while spiritually gazing, with feelings of unmingled delight upon Him, who is "the resurrection and the life," and contemplating, with silent admiration, His infinite, absolute, divine perfections, they can say with confidence: "THIS GOD IS OUR GOD, FOR EVER AND EVER. HE WILL BE OUR GUIDE EVEN UNTO DEATH."

D. Y. H.

Bethlehem, Pa.

Art. VI.—THE NATIONAL QUESTION.

There are ever two living forces at work in a Commonwealth. The one is the necessity of unity; the other, of subordinate constituents. From these are developed the authority of the whole civil organism and the freedom of its several parts; or the sovereign power of Government and the rights of individuals and communities. Both are legitimate; because both are grounded in the constitution of man. Each possesses claims to a due measure of recognition. These forces are different and opposite, but not contradictory. Like the centripetal and centrifugal forces which hold the planetary system in its sublime unvarying order, the action of each is complemental to the counteraction of the other.

One great problem of society has been to equalize these necessary and unchangeable tendencies, or rather to harmonize them in a system of Government in which both shall have free scope, each meet the demands of the other, and yet neither exceed its proper limits. Government is strong and just, and society well-regulated and prosperous, other things being equal, in the degree that this great end has been attained. In such a commonwealth, Government does not exercise its power in violation of the rights of individuals and communities, and individuals or parties do not usurp the authority vested alone in Government; but both work harmoniously, each within its own province; Government protecting the individual, and respecting all his rights in the enactment, enforcement and execution of laws, whilst individuals support the Government, obey the laws and, when suffering wrong, seek redress according to the provisions of law.

The operation of these forces exposes society to a twofold danger. Either tendency may develop itself abnor-

mally. Overlooking or disregarding the rights of individuals and communities, the authority of Government may become tyranny and oppression. Then arises a conflict between "the powers that be" and individual freedom; the constituted authorities arrogating prerogatives which belong to the people, and the people contending for the rights and privileges which inhere in rational, moral beings. If Government does not yield to their just demands, and the people possess sufficient intelligence, energy and strength, the conflict issues in insurrection and revolution. And a revolution growing out of this cause commands the lively sympathy and firm support of the mass of mankind.

The other danger to society arises from an opposite cause. The people may transcend their province and usurp the prerogatives of Government. True freedom may degenerate into arbitrary will and lawless violence. Then again there arises a conflict between Government and the people, but a conflict of a wholly different character. The relation is just reversed. It is the conservative element as embodied in established Government that joins issue with radicalism; the positive is in conflict with the negative forces of society. The positive element maintains the existing order of civil affairs, sustains the constitution and the laws as they are, or would modify them according to the provisions of the law, and enforces subjection and obedience among all who owe allegiance to the Government. The negative element would change or overturn the existing order on account of its imperfections, whether real or apparent, ignore all obligations, abrogate the law unlawfully, and set aside the civil authority at the dictation of arbitrary opinion. The one would subordinate the passions and impulses of the individual, or a party, to the law of the land; the other would subordinate the law, its interpretation and execution, to the will and caprice of lawless individuals. This conflict may also result in insurrection or a general rebellion. But as the issue is a different one, though the parties to the conflict are the same, so the judgment of mankind concerning it is reversed. Right,

truth and justice are unquestionably on the side of Government.

These primary forces of civilized society are the factors of history; or, more properly, the human factors, as distinguished from the controlling Providence of God, which is the divine factor. Existing in human nature and society as integral elements; they are ineradicable, and their influence irrepressible. Neither one can annihilate the other. The tendency to unity, consolidation and authority, which, when perverted, becomes tyranny and oppression, quickens the idea of individual right and freedom and evokes insurrection and revolution. On the other hand, the innate sense of right and love of freedom which, when perverted, produce anarchy and inaugurate a reign of terror, exhibit the necessity and intensify the desire of established law and civil order. The law of the social organism acts, in such cases, like the law of gravitation on the pendulum of a clock, carrying it to and fro from the one to the other extreme of the arc. Hence neither despotism nor anarchy can be perpetual; a truth illustrated by the history of the world. Either may continue for a shorter or longer period, according to circumstances; but each prepares the way and gives place to the other, and must continue to do so in every nation or country until society, advanced to a higher stadium, organizes a form of government in which these contrary forces are in equilibrium. Then if the people possess sufficient intelligence and virtue to sustain it, the stream of history will flow in a smoother channel.

This two-fold principle furnishes the key to the history of the great American Government. The thirteen original colonies, subject to the authority of Great Britain, were content comparatively and prosperous in their state of dependence on the will of the King and the British Parliament, so long as the rights of the people, guaranteed by the constitution of England and the charters of the different colonies respectively, were duly respected. But when these rights were violated; when the British Government, intent mainly on filling the national coffers, enacted the

offensive and oppressive revenue laws of 1763, and followed them, in defiance of the petitions and remonstrances sent to Parliament from all parts of the colonies, by the passage of the odious Stamp Act of March, 1765; when the petitions of the Colonies, which enumerated in dignified and respectful terms the great wrongs they were enduring and besought Parliament on behalf of the inhabitants for no more than the free exercise of the rights they possessed as subjects of the British Crown, were answered by a dogged persistence in unjust legislation, by renewed acts of violence on sea and land, and a tone of supercilious contempt in the entire bearing of George III. and his ministry towards the American people; then the keen sense of injustice and tyranny was fanned into the flame of revolution which spread, as in the twinkling of an eye, throughout the length and breadth of the land. The battle of Lexington, April 19th, 1775, was the opening of a war against the usurpations of governmental authority waged in the name of freedom for eight long years, and terminated in the acknowledgment on the part of Great Britain, of the independence of the thirteen confederated colonies.

The war of the American Revolution was a reaction of the popular mind against the abuses of authority and power by Government,—a reaction that, becoming deeper, stronger and more general from week to week, and month to month, broke forth into overt acts of rebellion only after twelve years' endurance of political and moral wrongs. It was the instinct of an intelligent people educated into the idea of true freedom, as distinguished alike from slavery and licentiousness, despotism and lawlessness, by the constitution and laws of England itself, at once the bulwark of constitutional government and the bold invader of the rights guaranteed by it to the individual.

The treaty of peace signed at Paris, September 3rd, 1783, set the seal of official recognition to the victory gained on the battle-field. The great end was accomplished. The colonies were free from British domination. But a new danger to individual liberty and public order reared its hor-

rid head in the midst of the new-born nation. The colonies were independent of England, and independent of each other. The constitution of 1781 was only a league. It formed nothing more than an association of independent States, each of which claimed and exercised the authority of a sovereign within its own territory. There was no organic unity; no central power; no authority to enact and execute laws for the common weal; no principle of life to energize and consolidate the entire body politic.

The consequence was a process of disintegration and dissolution, which began to show itself so soon as peace had been declared. During the first two years after the Articles of confederation had been adopted, 1781 to 1783, the continuance of the war served as an external occasion to bind the different States together. The sense of a common danger led to mutual coöperation for the purpose of achieving a common independence. But that end once attained and the outward occasion for coöperation no longer existing, the common inheritance exhibited the premonitory symptoms of approaching death. "We had achieved our independence, but we had not constructed a nation. We were not a body politic. No laws could be enforced, no insurrections suppressed, no debt collected. Neither property nor life were secure. Great Britain had made a treaty of peace with us, but she scornfully declined a treaty of commerce and amity; not because we had been rebels, but because we were not a state—because we were a mere dissolving league of jarring provinces, incapable of guarantying the stipulations of any commercial treaty. * * * * For *twelve* years after the acknowledgment of our *independence* we were mortified by the spectacle of foreign soldiers occupying a long chain of fortresses south of the great lakes and upon our own soil. We were a confederacy. We were sovereign States. And these were the fruits of such a confederacy and such a sovereignty."* There was no government. The "powers that be" which are "ordained of God," were not acknowledged by the country, neither

*Motley's Letter to the *London Times*, May 23rd, and 24th, 1861.

did they exist in any real form for the people as a whole. There was not in the land a "minister of God, a revenger to execute wrath upon him that doeth evil."† Congress was only the agent and counsellor of a civil association—an association of States having diverse and opposing interests, ruled each by the popular will, and distracted by party intrigues, and party animosities. The country which, by its heroism on the field of blood, had won a recognition of independence, and stood up in moral grandeur proclaiming opposition to tyranny, and civil freedom for the people, in the face of the world, was prostrated by a deep-rooted disease rankling at its heart's core. The pendulum had swung to the opposite extreme of the arc. The centrifugal force of society was unrestrained by the centripetal. The individual will deferred only to the dictates of its arbitrary self; and refused to acknowledge any general authority. The independent colonies were on the eve of anarchy. A fearful abyss was opening its jaws to devour them.

The abnormal action of the integral forces inherent in humanity had, at this period of our history, developed the two great generic, but opposite, evils of society on American soil. The one was the abuse of legitimate authority and power on the part of the British Government, which put upon the people the fetters of a degrading vassalage. The constituted authorities in violation of a most sacred obligation, trod under foot the rights of the people.

The other evil was the abuse of independence and individual freedom, which plunged the American people into a state of incipient anarchy. This was the most critical period in our history. A crisis it was, without doubt, of infinite moment. Rent asunder by sectional jealousy, party feuds, and individual selfishness; without commerce, wealth or credit; burdened with an enormous debt; and secretly undermined by Tory power, still comparatively influential;—the nation lay bleeding from ghastly wounds inflicted by its own hand; whilst the British lion, crouch-

†Rom. 13: 4.

ing on our frontier, was watching for the nick of time to spring upon his helpless victim and crush republican institutions to death under his ruthless paw.

In the Providence of God, light broke in upon the deep, dismal darkness. Through the commanding influence of General Washington and his noble compeers, the people were aroused to a sense of their extreme danger. A national Convention assembled in Philadelphia, representing not the States, but the people as a whole, to construct a Republican Government. The history of the preceding thirty years, and the general confusion and disorder then prevailing, had clearly brought to light the two radical evils to which we have referred. To secure freedom, order and prosperity a two-fold remedy was required; namely, on the one hand, a constitutional government invested with legitimate authority to act directly upon the people, irrespective of State organizations, thus forming one commonwealth of which the States would be integral dependent parts; and, on the other, a guarantee to individuals, communities, States and sections, of all the rights appertaining to each, which are essential to true freedom. The Convention addressed itself, in the fear of God, to the execution of the difficult and momentous work.

Before the revolution the evil consisted in oppression. The people did not possess their rights. They had no voice in the enactment of general laws. Taxes were levied without their consent. Other burdens were imposed against their judgment and will. This evil was to be remedied. It was done by framing a Constitution which guarantees to all qualified persons the right of electing by ballot all the members of the legislative and executive departments of State; the rights and duties of each being defined and limited by the organic law. The judiciary it removes from the immediate control of popular will; and places the power of appointment in the hands of the President and Senate, the one being the highest immediate representative of the people, and the other the highest immediate representative of the States. All the rights of individuals apper-

taining to the most perfect state of civil freedom are therefore secure so long as the Constitution of the United States remains in force. If it falls, the rights of the people, North and South, fall with it. If ignored and set aside by a faction, or by intrigue, the deep, broad foundation of popular freedom is gone. Shall the Federal Constitution remain in force, or be thrown to the winds?

After the acknowledgment of American independence, the evil consisted in the sovereignty of the States. Congress was scarcely more than an advisory body. Each State could approve or disapprove, confirm or annul, congressional proceedings. It could continue in the confederacy or withdraw from it—support the league or secede. Hence the immediate danger of dissolution and anarchy. The country was in want of a principle of vitality, national union and strength. This want is met in the Constitution by forming a central Government possessing supreme authority and power over all the people, regarded as individuals and as composing States. It takes from each State the attribute of independence and sovereignty; the right of confirming or annulling the acts of Congress; all claim to the primary allegiance of its citizens; and the power of continuing its subordinate relation to the general government, or separating from it, at will. Each State is made a dependent government, limited and controlled in its three essential functions by the provisions of the Constitution. The people may frame a State Constitution, but it must be determined in the elements of its general character by the Federal Constitution which is "the *supreme law* of the land, any thing in the constitution or laws of any State to the contrary notwithstanding."* The Governor elect of a State, and the members elect of the several Legislatures, can not be inducted into office but "by oath or affirmation, to support this Constitution."† No one can fill the office of Judge in a State, unless by oath or affirmation, he previously binds himself to be governed in all his decisions by "the *supreme law* of the land." If the people incorporate an ar-

* Constitution, Art. VI. Sec. 2. † Ibid. Art. VI. Sec. 3.

ticle, or section, in a State Constitution, which is inconsistent with the Supreme Law, it is *ipso facto* null and void. If a State Legislature enact a law which contravenes the Supreme Law, though it be passed unanimously, signed by the Governor, and ratified by the people, it is nevertheless null and void; because the federal Constitution is the Supreme Law for individuals and States. If the Supreme Court of a State give a decision which is at variance with the Supreme Law, though it be agreeable to the State Constitution, it is overruled and set aside by the Supreme Court of the United States, and thereby becomes null and void; for "the Judges of every State shall be bound" * by the Supreme Law, any thing in the Constitution or Laws of any State to the contrary notwithstanding.

Neither the people, nor any branch of the State Government, have the right to authorize an act, or pass a law, or execute any measure, unless it be conformable to the requirements of the Federal Constitution. To contravene and oppose the enactments of Congress, was a right which the people, and the States, held in the confederacy of 1781. This right was the root of evil—the source of weakness, contention and general demoralization—the cause of a process of dissolution rapidly bearing the States to the verge of destruction, from which all the thinking patriots of the day turned away appalled. The existence of this right, more than any thing else, was seen to be the curse of the land; and aroused the public mind to a deep sense of the necessity of abolishing it. To the leading minds of the day it was as clear as the sun-light, that this right must be utterly destroyed, or *it* would utterly destroy the independence and liberties of the nation. For this express purpose therefore the National Convention of 1787 was assembled; and the wisdom, learning, patriotism and piety of the land, were combined to form a Constitution and, in virtue of it, a general Government that would abolish the confederacy, destroy the independence of the States, and

* Constitution Art. VI. Sect. 2.

annihilate all States rights inhering in sovereignty; yet guarantee the unrestricted right of suffrage and representation, both to individual citizens and the States.

The House of Representatives is the immediate organ of the people, the representatives being apportioned among the several States according to the respective numbers, and chosen by a majority of legal voters. The Senate is the immediate organ of the States, two members being chosen by the Legislature of each one, irrespective of population or extent of territory. The two-fold immediate relation of the general Government to individual citizens and the States enters, thus into the structure of Congress, in which are vested all the legislative powers granted by the Constitution. From the operation of its enactments, so long as they continue in force, there is no right of appeal reserved to any State or individual.

When the Constitution was submitted to the vote of the people of the several States, the true issue assumed prominence at once. Shall we relinquish the independence of the States? This was the vital point. Shall we abolish the confederacy of sovereign States? Shall we "form a more *perfect union*?"* Shall the people establish one consolidated government, possessing authority and powers limited and defined by the organic law, but extending immediately to each individual and each State? Shall the States become each only a subordinate member of the great civil organism, possessing only such rights as are given by the Federal Constitution, or not prohibited by it? On this hinge the whole controversy of the day turned. The friends and supporters of the new Constitution were numerous and influential in every State, yet the opposition was formidable. It gathered strength just from the fact that the introduction of the new order of things would strike a death blow at the independence and sovereignty of the States. It was seen that the new Government would be such a powerful central authority, and sweep away so entirely from the States the

* Preamble of Constitution.

right to resist or nullify federal enactments, or separate at will from the union, that some of the wisest patriots of the time hesitated. In some of the States, New York for example, the result of the contest was doubtful for months. But the absolute necessity of terminating the prevailing confusion and national weakness by transforming State sovereignty into State subordination to a central Power, stared all intelligent men in the face. It could not be ignored. The vital question was discussed in all its bearings. The real issue was fairly and fully before the minds of the people. And it was met. One after another, the people of the several States adopted the new Constitution; and thus knowingly and designedly changed the entire character of the Government. They changed it in order to make each individual a citizen of the United States, and constitute the Federal Government the only sovereign* in the land.

That such was the true issue in 1787, is proved by the history of the American people during the revolutionary war and the period in which the confederation existed; by the nature of the evils which were the occasion of calling the National Convention, and demonstrated its necessity; by the character of the discussions on the floor of the Convention, pending the formation of the Constitution; by the nature of the controversy which agitated the whole country whilst the question of adoption was before the people; by the teaching of all the founders of the government, and all the accredited defenders of the Constitution from Washington, Jefferson and Madison to Jackson, Clay, Webster

* The attribute of sovereignty does not belong to a State, in any proper sense of the word. The State has authority to establish its own Government, enact its own laws, choose its own officers and administer the laws, within its limits, according to its own judgment; but the character of the State Government, of the laws enacted, and the administration of affairs, can not in any particular be contrary to the Constitution and laws of the United States. Within these limits set by the supreme authority, the State has the right to govern itself according to its own will. It is only a relative, limited and subordinate power; and bound to submit to every constitutional requirement of the general government.

and Douglas; by the decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States; by the administration of Washington, Adams, Jefferson, and Madison; indeed, more or less, by the administration of every President down to the present time; and by none more clearly than that of General Jackson—the most vigorous, and also the most popular, administration of the Federal Government for the last forty years.

The triumph of the Constitution gave existence to a Government in which the contrary forces of society, general authority and individual freedom, the prerogatives of the whole and the rights of single parts, are so nicely adjusted, that instead of encroaching one upon the other, they supply each one what the other demands; and thus develop consolidation and strength without working oppression; guarantee freedom without encouraging lawlessness; establish one supreme, all-embracing power, legislative, judicial and executive, without infringing the prerogatives of the States; and annihilate State independence, and with it the right of nullification or secession, without impairing the authority of the State within its legitimate sphere. Under its powerful, yet mild sway of three quarters of a century, the United States have advanced with unparallelled rapidity in agiculture, commerce, and manufactures; power, wealth and happiness; art, science and religion; and one year ago held rank, in point of population, character, influence and greatness, with the first nations on the face of the globe.

Shall this Constitution continue in force, or be destroyed by treason? Shall the Government be *the* Government which the Constitution makes it? Shall the Republic be perpetuated, or overthrown by rebellion and supplanted by despotism? This is the real issue—the life-question for the American people. It can not be ignored or evaded, but must be met and solved.

It is at bottom the old question of 1775, though presenting itself in a different form. Shall society be governed by the authority of right, or arbitrary will? Then a constitutional government transformed itself into tyranny,

against which a loyal people protested and prayed, and finally rose up, seizing the sword in defence of law and freedom; now a faction of the people, living under a Constitution framed by themselves, under laws passed by their own vote, and under an administration announced to be lawfully chosen by its own candidate for the office of President, resorts to plunder, theft, robbery and open war against a generous government, that maintains the Constitution, enforces the laws, and protects all the rights of individuals and States. The real issue is the same; but the wrong tenfold more flagrant.

It is the question of 1787 revived. Shall there be a Federal Government, or not? Shall the States be sovereign, or subordinate to the Supreme Law of the land? At that time, the Constitution was only a theory, and the Government a prospective experiment; now the Constitution has vitalized a nation of freemen, and the Government has become a most sublime reality. Then the question related to an opinion: Shall we adopt the new Constitution? Every man had a legal right to think and decide for himself. Now the question pertains to a matter of fact. Shall the established Government be perpetuated, or overthrown? Shall the many govern the few according to the Constitution, or the few govern the many in violation of the Constitution? Shall the Union be transmitted to posterity, or supplanted by a confederacy? Shall the integrity of the country be maintained, or give place to disintegration? Shall the American nation live, or die?

So soon as the electric wires bore the Proclamation of the President throughout the Republic, announcing the common danger and calling the nation to arms, millions of men and women caught the true issue of the conflict as by the inspiration of Heaven, and sent back the response in tones of thunder that shook the continent and startled the world: *The Constitution and the Union.* In sixty days, two hundred and fifty thousand men sprang into place in martial array, fully equipped to meet rebellion in arms, and eager to strike in defence of the laws—each one re-

solved, at every cost, to maintain the supremacy of the Constitution and the integrity of the Union. This is the echo of the national heart to the voice of the Chief Magistrate. A spectacle so sublime, and yet so terrible, has never before been witnessed in the history of any nation. If reason can not do it; if forbearance is taken for cowardice, and peaceful expostulation for weakness; the sword must be drawn to solve the national question; for "the powers that be" do not bear "the sword in vain." "Whosoever therefore resisteth the power, resisteth the ordinance of God, and they that resist shall receive to themselves damnation."

Let not the drawn sword be put back into its sheath until rebellion has bowed in submission to the sovereign majesty of established Law.

E. V. G.

ART. VII.—RECENT PUBLICATIONS.

THE NEW AMERICAN CYCLOPAEDIA: A popular Dictionary of General Knowledge. Edited by *George Ripley* and *Charles A. Dana*. Vol. XII. Mozambique—Parr. New York: D. Appleton & Co. 1861.

Although the book trade is nearly prostrated by the civil war, the "American Cyclopaedia" seems to have suffered no interruption as yet. We have just received Vol. XII, which finishes letters M. N. and O. with a part of letter P. Having recently expressed our views on the general character and merits of this great national work, it is sufficient to say that the last Vol. is behind none of its predecessors and contains valuable biographical sketches of a number of living characters not yet represented as far as we know in any other Cyclopaedia. Among these is also the Rev. Dr. Nevin, the founder and former editor of this Review. The sketch which is fair and just, will interest our readers and may give them an idea of the biographical department of the Appleton Cyclopaedia. We take this occasion to correct a slight error in the article. Dr. Schaff's "Principle of Protestantism" was not published "in the same year" with the "Anxious Bench," as here stated, but two years later, in 1845.

"NEVIN, *John Williamson*, D. D., an American theologian, born in Franklin county, Penn'a., Feb. 20th, 1803. He was graduated at Union College, New York, in 1821, studied theology for three years in the Theological Seminary at Princeton, N. J., and continued there two years afterwards as assistant teacher in the place of Professor Hodge, then absent in Europe. During this time he wrote "Biblical Antiquities," (2 vols., 1828). He was licensed to preach by the presbytery of Carlisle in 1828. Toward the close of 1829 he was called to the Western Theological Seminary of the Presbyterian Church in Alleghany city, where he continued as assistant teacher, and afterwards

as professor of Hebrew, and Biblical Literature, for ten years; and in the mean while he was ordained. He also edited in 1833 and 1834 "The Friend," a weekly literary journal published under the auspices of the Young Men's Society of Pittsburg and its vicinity. In 1840 he removed to Mercersburg, Penn'a., in obedience to a call from the Synod of the German Reformed Church inviting him to take charge of its Theological Seminary, in connection with Dr. F. A. Rauch, who was at the same time president of Marshall College in the same place. The death of Dr. Rauch, March 2, 1841, left him in the sole charge of the Theological Seminary and the Presidency of the College, till 1844, when Dr. Philip Schaff was called as his colleague in the Seminary. In 1843 he published "The Anxious Bench," which calls in question the propriety of certain means and measures then extensively employed in the service of religious revivals. This work furnished occasion for much controversy. It was enlarged in a subsequent edition, and also translated into German. The same year he published a translation of Dr. Schaff's "Principle of Protestantism," with an introduction, and a sermon on "Catholic Unity." In 1846 he published "The Mystical Presence," a vindication of the reformed doctrine of the holy Eucharist; in 1847, the "History and Genius of the Heidelberg Catechism;" in 1848, "Antichrist, or the Spirit of Sect and Schism." From Jan. 1849, to Jan. 1853, he edited the "Mercersburg Review," published by the Alumni Association of Marshall College, which is still continued, and to which he has been up to this time (1860) a prominent contributor. At the close of 1851 he resigned his situation as Professor in the Theological Seminary, continuing to act as President of Marshall College until its union with Franklin College at Lancaster, Pa., in 1853, and its subsequent removal to that place. He was offered the Presidency of the College in its new form, but declined it. He now lives in literary retirement near Lancaster. It was during Dr. Nevin's connection with the theological and literary institutions at Mercersburg, and the "Mercersburg Review," that the movement began and was carried forward which has developed itself into what is called the "Mercersburg System of Theology." Of this movement Dr. Nevin was the originator and exponent. It seemed to grow into shape without calculation or plan. It owes its existence properly not to any spirit of philosophical speculation, as has been sometimes imagined, but to an active interest in practical Christianity. Historically it may be regarded as having commenced with the publication of "The Anxious Bench" in 1843. Then came the sermon on "Church Unity," preached by Dr. Nevin at the opening of the triennial convention of the Reformed Dutch and German Reformed Churches at Harrisburg, Pa., in 1844; a discourse sanctioned by the official representatives of both Churches at the time, the positions of which, however, on the subject of the mystical union and in opposition to the sect system,

were felt by many afterwards to involve a dangerous tendency. Dr. Schaff's "Principle of Protestantism" brought out the tendency, in the apprehension of such persons, under still more alarming proportions. This was followed by the "Mystical Presence," with a translation of Dr. Ullmann's masterly tract on "The Distinctive Character of Christianity," prefixed in the form of a preliminary essay. The work was a vindication at large of the Calvinistic doctrine of the Lord's Supper, conveying against the general Protestantism of the time a charge of wholesale defection from the Protestant sacramental faith of the 16th century. The tract "Antichrist" was an assault upon the sect system, as being in full antagonism to the true idea of the Church, and such a heresy as draws after it virtually in the end a Gnostic denial of the proper mystery of the incarnation itself.

As the occasions of theological discussion were thus multiplied, it was felt necessary to establish a special organ for carrying it forward; and thus originated the "Mercersburg Review," the pages of which for some years form a sort of progressive picture of the system to whose exposition and defence it has been devoted from the first. The cardinal principle of the Mercersburg system is the fact of the incarnation. This viewed not as a doctrine or speculation, but as a real transaction of God in the world, is regarded as being necessarily itself the sphere of Christianity, the sum and substance of the whole Christian redemption. Christ saves the world, not ultimately by what he teaches, or by what he does, but by what he is in the constitution of his person. His person in its relations to the world carries in it the power of victory over sin, death, and hell, the force thus of a real atonement or reconciliation between God and man, the triumph of a glorious resurrection from the dead, and all the consequences for faith, which are attributed to this in the Apostles' Creed. In the most literal sense accordingly Christ is here held to be "the way, the truth and the life," the principle of "life and immortality," the "light" of the world, its "righteousness," and its "peace." The "grace which bringeth salvation" in this view, is of course always a real effluence from the new order of existence, which has thus been called into being by the exaltation of the Word made flesh at the right hand of God. It must be supernatural as well as natural, and the organs and agencies by which it works must in the nature of the case carry with them objectively something of the same character and force.

In this way the Church is an object of faith; the presence of a new creation in the old world of nature; the body of Christ, through which as a medium and organ he reveals himself and works till the end of time. It mediates with supernatural office instrumentally between Christ and his people. Its ministers hold a divine power from him by apostolic succession. Its sacraments are not signs merely, but seals of the grace they represent. Baptism is for the remission of sins. The eucharist includes the real presence of Christ's whole glo-

rified life, in a mystery, by the power of the Holy Ghost. The idea of the Church, when it is thus held as an object of faith, involves necessarily the attributes which were always ascribed to it in the beginning, unity, sanctity, catholicity, and apostolicity. The spirit of sect, as it cleaves to Protestantism at the present time, is a very great evil, which is of itself sufficient to show that if Protestantism has any historical justification in the beginning, its mission thus far has been only half fulfilled, and that it can be rationally approved only as it is taken to be an intermediate preparation for some higher and better form of Christianity hereafter. The distinguishing character of the Mercersburg Theology, in one word, is its Christological interest, its way of looking at all things through the person of the crucified and risen Saviour. This as the world now stands, embraces necessarily all that enters into the conception of the Church question, which this system holds to be the great problem for the Christianity of the present time."

THE CHARACTER OF JESUS: Forbidding his possible Classification with Men. By HORACE BUSHNELL. New York: Charles Scribner. 1861.

This is an exact reprint of the Tenth Chapter of Dr. Bushnell's work on *Nature and the Supernatural*, noticed in a former number of this Review. It is acknowledged by all critics to be the gem of this remarkable work, and hence well worthy of a separate publication and wider circulation. It is a masterly argument for the superhuman character of Jesus of Nazareth, full of glowing thoughts and burning words. If Dr. Bushnell had never written any thing else, this alone would entitle him to a leading rank among the divines of the age.

The idea is not altogether new. Reinhard commenced this line of argument by his well known tract on the *Plan of Jesus*. Ullman followed it in his *Sinlessness of Christ*. Young added some additional features in his *Christ of History*. Our own recent tract on the *Moral Character of Christ* belongs to the same class of works. But Bushnell has freely reproduced the general idea, clothed it with the charms of his own rich genius and given it a highly eloquent and almost poetical finish. He wrote evidently for the New England latitude and in view of the skeptical tendencies there prevalent of late. He meets more especially the objections of Theodore Parker and the Unitarians generally. He, indeed, does not go far enough. His argument leads simply to the conclusion that Christ is a superhuman, but not necessarily a strictly divine person. He may

have had special reasons for stopping half way, and it may be all the better for the particular phase of unbelief he wishes to meet. He is all right as far as he goes and may accomplish a great deal of good by it. But starting from the same premises, we cannot stop short of the conclusion that the absolute perfection of Christ's humanity in the midst of a universally sinful world is the great moral miracle of history and a proof of his divinity or essential unity with the Father according to his own sublime declaration: "I and the Father are one," and according to the declaration of the skeptical Thomas freely accepted by him: "My Lord and my God."

Thus carried out the argument in question is one of the strongest internal evidences of Christianity, and appeals especially to all the honest enquirers of the present age. Christ is the Saviour of the world not so much by what he teaches, or by what he does, but first of all by what he *is* in his own divine human person. He himself is the Light of the world, the Way, the Truth and the Life, the Resurrection and the Life everlasting. His doctrine and work can only be properly understood as the necessary emanation of his person, as the light is the emanation of the sun.

This truth has been from the beginning the ruling idea in what has been styled right or wrong the Mercersburg system of theology. It starts in this view of Christ, and all its other tenets of the mystical life union with Christ, of the Church as the body of Christ, of sacramental grace, etc., are legitimate and true only as far as they develop and carry out this noble principle and tend to the glory of our heavenly Redeemer. Sound churchliness can only hold in sound Christliness. All the rest is chaff which the wind may drive away, the sooner the better. As far and as long as churchly principles are based upon this rock of ages, there can be no danger and harm in them, they can only tend to promote a healthy and vigorous practical Christianity. For true piety consists in the imitation of the life of Christ and the transformation of the whole man into his holy and heavenly image.

Mr. Scribner has given this tract a most elegant outfit, and we do no not remember ever having seen a more tasty little book of the same size. We only wish that it may find a large circulation.

P. S.

CHRISTIAN NURTURE. By Horace Bushnell. New York: Charles Scribner, 1861.

Thirteen years ago Dr. Bushnell published two discourses on the nature of Christian Nurture. The little volume was reviewed in this Quarterly by Dr. Nevin. Afterwards, these were republished with another, the fourth of the present work. Thirteen new essays, in the form of discourses, though never used as such, as the author informs us in the Preface, but written simply for the discussion's sake, are now added; and the volume, which virtually covers the ground of a treatise, takes the form of successive topical discussions, or essays, on so many themes included in the general subject.

The author grapples with a deep-rooted evil in the Christian Church of modern times—a want of faith in educational religion. In opposition to prevailing theories, he develops with easy logic, and in vigorous, flowing diction, the nature, necessity and mode of Christian nurture. The subject involves the Covenant and Baptism; the organic character of the Family; church membership of children; parental qualifications, and training; family government; and the regulations, privileges and restrictions of home-life. The handling of each topic is free, bold, profound and earnest; bringing out most wholesome and necessary truths, adapted to the present attitude, in theory and practice, of a large proportion of professing Christians.

Yet the book, timely and powerful as it is, does not meet the demand. It acknowledges the Covenant, and vindicates infant Baptism; but the one is not an objective state of grace, and the other is not the act of God translating its subject from the dominion of the curse into that state. The covenant is a promise, rather than a spiritual reality; and Baptism a token, the seal of a promise, rather than a sacrament, the medium of divine power. Infant church membership is presumptive, rather than real—a prophecy rather than a fulfillment. Grace accordingly must reach children by the Holy Ghost working in natural channels; not by the Holy Ghost in channels of His own creation—must reach them according to the organic law of human life, not according to the law of life in Christ Jesus. There is no principle of grace in the baptized child on which Christian Nurture acts; but human tuition, energized by the Spirit must beget it, the divinely instituted agency of the Holy

Ghost not being equal to the work. The child remains really in a state of nature; and Nurture is required to develop nature into grace. An impossibility.

The book moves, thus, on the low plane of nature, rather than in the sphere of the new creation; and looks to natural agencies, as means of the Spirit, to quicken the new life, rather than to the almighty grace of God working in his own ordinance. "Baptism doth also now save us" (1 Pet. 3 : 21). Assume that children occupy a position of grace in the covenant; that as many "as have been baptized into Christ, have put on Christ" (Gal. 3 : 27), and the argument proceeding on this principle would be sound, apposite, powerful for good, and irresistible.

E. V. G.

ELEMENTS OF MORAL PHILOSOPHY; analytical, synthetical, and practical. By Hubbard Winslow, author of Intellectual Philosophy. New York: D. Appleton & Co.

The value of a work on Moral Philosophy depends mainly on two things: a sound principle of moral obligation by which the science is ruled in all its parts; and a logical development of the principle in a scientific system. The work of Dr. Winslow does not profess to possess the first; for he teaches that there are *many* principles of morality; not *one* only. There is the principle of *Temperance* to regulate the *appetite* for food and drink; the principle of *Benevolence* to regulate the affections, desires and emotions; the principle of *Justice* that determines proper regard for the rights of our fellow-men. So in other respects. We have the principles of *Chastity*, of *Veracity*, *Faithfulness*, *Gratitude* and *Religion*, each regulating moral conduct in a particular relation. But *the* principle to which all others are subordinate, is not affirmed. Yet the leading idea of the book seems to be that the *right* consists in moral activity which is conformable to the law of God; and so far forth it is decidedly superior to some of the most popular works on the Science of Morality in the English language.

As regards method, it is not wanting either. There is a well-defined system pursued from beginning to end. But it is the method of the author—the plan which he has chosen to adopt; and not the method which the laws of scientific statement and discussion require. It is subjective rather than objective.

We commend the book for its deep earnestness; its reverence for religious truth; and unqualified deference to the Sacred Scriptures; yet we look in vain for the recognition of the relation which the Lord Jesus Christ bears to all Scriptural morality. And none other is worthy of the name.

E. V. G.

THE FAMILY, FARM AND GARDENS, AND THE DOMESTIC ANIMALS. In three Parts. Illustrated. Edited by E. G. Storke from the latest and best authorities. Auburn Publishing Company, Auburn, N. Y.

A practical book. It teaches how to keep house, provide, cook, preserve health, manage a household; treats of the management of the farm, kitchen-garden, fruit-garden, and flower-garden; of the domestic animals, the horse, ox, sheep, etc. A very valuable manual for the family, farmer and horticulturist. The aim of the Editor is to be useful rather than original. He has collected the most important information, from the most recent and reliable sources, and arranged it in such form as renders it at once easy of comprehension and practice, and therefore useful to the masses.

The plan of the work is good; and has been well executed.

E. V. G.

A HISTORY OF ALL NATIONS, from the earliest Periods to the Present Time: or, Universal History; in which the History of every nation, Ancient and Modern, is separately given. Illustrated by 70 Stylographic Maps, and 700 Engravings, by S. G. Goodrich. 2 vols. 8 vo.

Of the characteristics of the author of Peter Parley's works it is not necessary to speak, being favorably known, especially among the youth, by his "Tales," "Cabinet Library," "Recollections of a Life-Time," &c., &c., wherever the English Language is spoken.

The *History of all Nations* is a popular work by a popular writer. It is comprehensive in its design, rich in details, clear and compact in style, and based on extensive study and research. It is not scientific and critical; nor does it profess to be. But it aims at a faithful reproduction of the best results of historical inquiry, in a form adapted to the wants of the people in general; and in this respect the author has been eminently successful. We know of no work of this class that has superior claims to high regard.

E. V. G.